THE CHANDOS CLASSICS

GIBBON'S ROMAN EMPIRE

ITS DECLINE AND FALL.

THE "CHANDOS CLASSICS."

THE

DECLINE AND FALL

OF THE

ROMAN EMPIRE.

BY

EDWARD GIBBON.

VERBATIM REPRINT.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
FREDERICK WARNE AND CO.
BEDFORD STREET, STRAND.

LONDON:
BRADBURY, AGNEW, & CO., PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

DILIGENCE and accuracy are the only merits which an historical writer may ascribe to himself; if any merit can be assumed from the performance of an indispensable duty. I may therefore be allowed to say that I have carefully examined all the original materials that could illustrate the subject which I had undertaken to treat.

At present I shall content myself with a single observation. The Biographers, who, under the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine, composed, or rather compiled, the Lives of the Emperors, from Hadrian to the sons of Carus, are usually mentioned under the names of Ælius Spartianus, Julius Capitolinus, Ælius Lampridius, Vulcatius Gallicanus, Trebellius Pollio, and Flavius Vopiscus. But there is so much perplexity in the titles of the MSS.; and so many disputes have arisen among the critics (see Fabricius, Biblioth. Latin. l. iii. c. 6. concerning their number, their names, and their respective property, that for the most part I have quoted them without distinction, under the general and well-known title of the *Augustan History*.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. XXVI.—*Manners of the Pastoral Nations.—Progress of the Huns.—Flight of the Goths.—Gothic War.—Death of Valens.—Gratian invests Theodosius with the Eastern Empire.—Settlement of the Goths.*

CHAP. XXVII.—*Death of Gratian.—St. Ambrose.—War against Maximus.—Administration of Theodosius.—Death of Valentinian II.—War against Eugenius.—Death of Theodosius.*

CHAP. XXXIII.—*Death of Honorius.—Valentinian* III.—*Placidia.—Ætius.—Boniface.—Conquest of Africa by the Vandals.*

CHAP. XXXIV.—*The conquests of Attila, king of the Huns.—Death of Theodosius.—Elevation of Marcian.*

CHAP. XXXV.—*Invasion of Gaul by Attila.—Repulsed by Ætius,—Attila invades Italy.—Deaths of Attila, Ætius, and Valentinian.*

THE

HISTORY OF THE DECLINE AND FALL

OF THE

ROMAN EMPIRE.

NOTE.—I shall embrace this opportunity of introducing two *verbal* remarks, which have not conveniently offered themselves to my notice. I. As often as I use the definition of *beyond* the Alps, the Rhine, the Danube, &c., I generally suppose myself at Rome, and afterwards at Constantinople; without observing whether this relative geography may agree with the local, but variable, situation of the reader, or the historian. II. In proper names of foreign, and especially of oriental, origin, it should always be our aim to express in our English version a faithful copy of the original. But this rule, which is founded on a just regard to uniformity and truth, must often be relaxed; and the exceptions will be limited or enlarged by the custom of the language or the taste of the interpreter. Our alphabets may be often defective; a harsh sound, an uncouth spelling, might offend the ear or the eye of our countrymen; and some words, notoriously corrupt, are fixed, and as it were naturalized, in the vulgar tongue. The prophet *Mohammed* can no longer be stripped of the famous, though improper, appellation of Mahomet: the well-known cities of Aleppo, Damascus, and Cairo, would almost be lost in the strange descriptions of *Haleb*, *Demashk*, and *Al Cahira:* the titles and offices of the Ottoman empire are fashioned by the practice of three hundred years; and we are pleased to blend the three Chinese monosyllables, *Con-fû-tzee*, in the respectable name of Confucius, or even to adopt the Portuguese corruption of Mandarin. But I would vary the use of Zoroaster and *Zerdusht*, as I drew my information from Greece or Persia: since our connection with India, the genuine *Timour* is restored to the throne of Tamerlane: our most correct writers have retrenched the *Al*, the superfluous article, from the Koran; and we escape an ambiguous termination, by adopting *Moslem* instead of Mussulman, in the plural number. In these and in a thousand examples, the shades of distinction are often minute; and I can feel, where I cannot explain, the motives of my choice.

CHAPTER XXII.

Julian is declared Emperor by the Legions of Gaul.—His March and Success.—The Death of Constantius.—Civil Administration of Julian.

WHILE the Romans languished under the ignominious tyranny of eunuchs and bishops, the praises of Julian were repeated with transport in every part of the empire, except in the palace of Constantius. The Barbarians of Germany had felt, and still dreaded, the arms of the young Cæsar; his soldiers were the companions of his victory; the grateful provincials enjoyed the blessings of his reign; but the

favourites, who had opposed his elevation, were offended by his virtues; and they justly considered the friend of the people as the enemy of the court. As long as the fame of Julian was doubtful, the buffoons of the palace, who were skilled in the language of satire, tried the efficacy of those arts which they had so often practised with success. They easily discovered, that his simplicity was not exempt from affectation: the ridiculous epithets of an hairy savage, of an ape invested with the purple, were applied to the dress and person of the philosophic warrior; and his modest dispatches were stigmatized as the vain and elaborate fictions of a loquacious Greek, a speculative soldier, who had studied the art of war amidst the groves of the Academy.[1] The voice of malicious folly was at length silenced by the shouts of victory; the conqueror of the Franks and Alemanni could no longer be painted as an object of contempt; and the monarch himself was meanly ambitious of stealing from his lieutenant the honourable reward of his labours. In the letters crowned with laurel, which, according to ancient custom, were addressed to the provinces, the name of Julian was omitted. "Constantius had made his dispositions in person; *he* had signalized his valour in the foremost "ranks; *his* military conduct had secured the victory; and the captive "king of the Barbarians was presented to *him* on the field of battle," from which he was at that time distant above forty days' journey.[2] So extravagant a fable was incapable, however, of deceiving the public credulity, or even of satisfying the pride of the emperor himself. Secretly conscious that the applause and favour of the Romans accompanied the rising fortunes of Julian, his discontented mind was prepared to receive the subtle poison of those artful sycophants, who coloured their mischievous designs with the fairest appearances of truth and candour.[3] Instead of depreciating the merits of Julian, they acknowledged, and even exaggerated, his popular fame, superior talents, and important services. But they darkly insinuated, that the virtues of the Cæsar might instantly be converted into the most dangerous crimes; if the inconstant multitude should prefer their inclinations to their duty; or if the general of a victorious army should be tempted from his allegiance by the hopes of revenge, and independent greatness. The personal fears of Constantius were interpreted by his council as a laudable anxiety for the public safety; whilst in private, and perhaps in his own breast, he disguised, under the less odious ap-

[1] Omnes qui plus poterant in palatio, adulandi professores jam docti, recte consulta, prospereque completa vertebant in deridiculum: talia sine modo strepentes insulse; in odium venit cum victoriis suis: capella, non homo; ut hirsutum Julianum carpentes, appellantesque loquacem talpam, et purpuratam simiam, et litterionem Græcum: et his congruentia plurima atque vernacula principi resonantes, audire hæc taliaque gestienti, virtutes ejus obruere verbis impudentibus conabantur, ut segnem incessentes et timidum et umbratilem, gestaque secus verbis comptioribus exornantem. Ammianus, xvii. 11.

[2] Ammian. xvi. 12. Themist. (iv. 56.) believed whatever was contained in the Imperial letters, which were addressed to the senate of Constantinople. Aurelius Victor, who published his Abridgment in the last year of Constantius, ascribes the German victories to the *wisdom* of the emperor, and the *fortune* of the Cæsar. Yet the historian, soon afterwards, was indebted to the favour or esteem of Julian for the honour of a brass statue; and the important offices of consular of the second Pannonia, and præfect of the city. Ammian. xxi. 10.

[3] Callido nocendi artificio, accusatoriam diritatem laudum titulis peragebant. . . Hæ voces fuerunt ad inflammanda odia probris omnibus potentiores. Mamertin. in Acti. Grati. in Vet. Paneg. xi. 5.

pellation of fear, the sentiments of hatred and envy, which he had secretly conceived for the inimitable virtues of Julian.

The apparent tranquillity of Gaul, and the imminent danger of the eastern provinces, offered a specious pretence for the design which was artfully concerted by the Imperial ministers. They resolved to disarm the Cæsar; to recall those faithful troops who guarded his person and dignity; and to employ in a distant war against the Persian monarch, the hardy veterans who had vanquished, on the banks of the Rhine, the fiercest nations of Germany. While Julian used the laborious hours of his winter-quarters at Paris in the administration of power, which, in his hands, was the exercise of virtue, he was (A.D. 360. April) surprised by the hasty arrival of a tribune and a notary; with positive orders from the emperor, which *they* were directed to execute, and *he* was commanded not to oppose. Constantius signified his pleasure, that four entire legions, the Celtæ, and Petulants, the Heruli, and the Batavians, should be separated from the standard of Julian, under which they had acquired their fame and discipline; that in each of the remaining bands, three hundred of the bravest youths should be selected; and that this numerous detachment, the strength of the Gallic army, should instantly begin their march, and exert their utmost diligence to arrive, before the opening of the campaign, on the frontiers of Persia.[1] The Cæsar foresaw, and lamented, the consequences of this fatal mandate. Most of the auxiliaries, who engaged their voluntary service, had stipulated, that they should never be obliged to pass the Alps. The public faith of Rome, and the personal honour of Julian, had been pledged for the observance of this condition. Such an act of treachery and oppression would destroy the confidence, and excite the resentment, of the independent warriors of Germany, who considered truth as the noblest of their virtues, and freedom as the most valuable of their possessions. The legionaries, who enjoyed the title and privileges of Romans, were enlisted for the general defence of the republic; but those mercenary troops heard with cold indifference the antiquated names of the republic and of Rome. Attached, either from birth or long habit, to the climate and manners of Gaul, they loved and admired Julian; they despised, and perhaps hated, the emperor; they dreaded the laborious march, the Persian arrows, and the burning deserts of Asia. They claimed, as their own, the country which they had saved; and excused their want of spirit, by pleading the sacred and more immediate duty of protecting their families and friends. The apprehensions of the Gauls were derived from the knowledge of the impending and inevitable danger. As soon as the provinces were exhausted of their military strength, the Germans would violate a treaty which had been imposed on their fears; and notwithstanding the abilities and valour of Julian, the general of a nominal army, to whom the public calamities would be imputed, must find himself, after a vain resistance, either a prisoner in the camp of the Barbarians, or a criminal in the palace of Con-

[1] The minute interval, which may be interposed, between the *hyeme adultâ* and the *primo vere* of Ammian. (xx. i. 4.), instead of allowing a sufficient space for a march of 3000 miles. would render the orders of Constantius as extravagant as they were unjust. The troops of Gaul could not have reached Syria till the end of autumn. The memory of Ammianus must have been inaccurate, and his language incorrect.

stantius. If Julian complied with the orders which he had received, he subscribed his own destruction, and that of a people who deserved his affection. But a positive refusal was an act of rebellion, and a declaration of war. The inexorable jealousy of the emperor, the peremptory, and perhaps insidious, nature of his commands, left not any room for a fair apology, or candid interpretation; and the dependent station of the Cæsar scarcely allowed him to pause or to deliberate. Solitude increased the perplexity of Julian; he could no longer apply to the faithful counsels of Sallust, who had been removed from his office by the judicious malice of the eunuchs: he could not even enforce his representations by the concurrence of the ministers, who would have been afraid, or ashamed, to approve the ruin of Gaul. The moment had been chosen, when Lupicinus,[1] the general of the cavalry, was dispatched into Britain, to repulse the inroads of the Scots and Picts; and Florentinus was occupied at Vienna by the assessment of the tribute. The latter, a crafty and corrupt statesman, declining to assume a responsible part on this dangerous occasion, eluded the pressing and repeated invitations of Julian, who represented to him, that in every important measure, the presence of the præfect was indispensable in the council of the prince. In the mean while the Cæsar was oppressed by the rude and importunate solicitations of the Imperial messengers, who presumed to suggest, that if he expected the return of his ministers, he would charge himself with the guilt of the delay, and reserve for them the merit of the execution. Unable to resist, unwilling to comply, Julian expressed, in the most serious terms, his wish, and even his intention, of resigning the purple, which he could not preserve with honour, but which he could not abdicate with safety.

After a painful conflict, Julian was compelled to acknowledge, that obedience was the virtue of the most eminent subject, and that the sovereign alone was entitled to judge of the public welfare. He issued the necessary orders for carrying into execution the commands of Constantius; a part of the troops began their march for the Alps; and the detachments from the several garrisons moved towards their respective places of assembly. They advanced with difficulty through the trembling and affrighted crowds of provincials; who attempted to excite their pity by silent despair, or loud lamentations; while the wives of the soldiers, holding their infants in their arms, accused the desertion of their husbands in the mixed language of grief, of tenderness, and of indignation. This scene of general distress afflicted the humanity of the Cæsar; he granted a sufficient number of post-waggons to transport the wives and families of the soldiers,[2] endeavoured to alleviate the hardships which he was constrained to inflict, and encreased, by the most laudable arts, his own popularity, and the

[1] Ammian. xx. 1. The valour of Lupicinus, and his military skill, are acknowledged by the historian, who, in his affected language, accuses the general of exalting the horns of his pride, bellowing in a tragic tone, and exciting a doubt, whether he was more cruel or avaricious. The danger from the Scots and Picts was so serious, that Julian himself had some thoughts of passing over into the island.

[2] He granted them the permission of the *cursus clavularis*, or *clabularis*. These post-waggons are often mentioned in the Code, and were supposed to carry fifteen hundred pounds weight. Vales. ad Ammian. xx. 4.

discontent of the exiled troops. The grief of an armed multitude is soon converted into rage; their licentious murmurs, which every hour were communicated from tent to tent with more boldness and effect, prepared their minds for the most daring acts of sedition; and by the connivance of their tribunes, a seasonable libel was secretly dispersed, which painted, in lively colours, the disgrace of the Cæsar, the oppression of the Gallic army, and the feeble vices of the tyrant of Asia. The servants of Constantius were astonished and alarmed by the progress of this dangerous spirit. They pressed the Cæsar to hasten the departure of the troops; but they imprudently rejected the honest and judicious advice of Julian; who proposed that they should not march through Paris, and suggested the danger and temptation of a last interview.

As soon as the approach of the troops was announced, the Cæsar went out to meet them, and ascended his tribunal, which had been erected in a plain before the gates of the city. After distinguishing the officers and soldiers, who by their rank or merit deserved a peculiar attention, Julian addressed himself in a studied oration to the surrounding multitude: he celebrated their exploits with grateful applause; encouraged them to accept, with alacrity, the honour of serving under the eyes of a powerful and liberal monarch; and admonished them, that the commands of Augustus required an instant and cheerful obedience. The soldiers, who were apprehensive of offending their general by an indecent clamour, or of belying their sentiments by false and venal acclamations, maintained an obstinate silence; and, after a short pause, were dismissed to their quarters. The principal officers were entertained by the Cæsar, who professed, in the warmest language of friendship, his desire and his inability to reward, according to their deserts, the brave companions of his victories. They retired from the feast, full of grief and perplexity; and lamented the hardship of their fate, which tore them from their beloved general and their native country. The only expedient which could prevent their separation was boldly agitated and approved; the popular resentment was insensibly moulded into a regular conspiracy; their just reasons of complaint were heightened by passion, and their passions were inflamed by wine; as, on the eve of their departure, the troops were indulged in licentious festivity. At the hour of midnight, the impetuous multitude, with swords, and bowls, and torches in their hands, rushed into the suburbs; encompassed the palace;[1] and, careless of future dangers, pronounced the fatal and irrevocable words, JULIAN AUGUSTUS! The prince, whose anxious suspence was interrupted by their disorderly acclamations, secured the doors against their intrusion; and, as long as it was in his power, secluded his person and dignity from the accidents of a nocturnal tumult. At the

[1] Most probably the palace of the baths (*Thermarum*), of which a solid and lofty hall still subsists in the *rue de la Harpe*. The buildings covered a considerable space of the modern quarter of the university; and the gardens, under the Merovingian kings, communicated with the abbey of St. Germain des Prez. By the injuries of time and the Normans, this ancient palace was reduced, in the twelfth century, to a maze of ruins; whose dark recesses were the scene of licentious love. Warton's Hist. of Eng. Poetry, vol. i. dissert. ii. The theological disputes of the Sorbonne have been since agitated on the same ground. Bonamy, Mem. de l'Acad. xv. 678—682.

dawn of day, the soldiers, whose zeal was irritated by opposition, forcibly entered the palace, seized, with respectful violence, the object of their choice, guarded Julian with drawn swords through the streets of Paris, placed him on the tribunal, and with repeated shouts saluted him as their emperor. Prudence, as well as loyalty, inculcated the propriety of resisting their treasonable designs; and of preparing for his oppressed virtue, the excuse of violence. Addressing himself by turns to the multitude and to individuals, he sometimes implored their mercy, and sometimes expressed his indignation; conjured them not to sully the fame of their immortal victories; and ventured to promise, that if they would immediately return to their allegiance, he would undertake to obtain from the emperor, not only a free and gracious pardon, but even the revocation of the orders which had excited their resentment. But the soldiers, who were conscious of their guilt, chose rather to depend on the gratitude of Julian, than on the clemency of the emperor. Their zeal was insensibly turned into impatience, and their impatience into rage. The inflexible Cæsar sustained till the third hour of the day, their prayers, their reproaches, and their menaces; nor did he yield, till he had been repeatedly assured, that if he wished to live, he must consent to reign. He was exalted on a shield in the presence, and amidst the unanimous acclamations, of the troops; a rich military collar, which was offered by chance, supplied the want of a diadem;[1] the ceremony was concluded by the promise of a moderate donative;[2] and the new emperor, overwhelmed with real or affected grief, retired into the most secret recesses of his apartment.[3]

The grief of Julian could proceed only from his innocence; but his innocence must appear extremely doubtful[4] in the eyes of those who have learned to suspect the motives and the professions of princes. His lively and active mind was susceptible of the various impressions of hope and fear, of gratitude and revenge, of duty and of ambition, of the love of fame and of the fear of reproach. But it is impossible for us to calculate the respective weight and operation of these sentiments; or to ascertain the principles of action, which might escape the observation, while they guided, or rather impelled, the steps of Julian himself. The discontent of the troops was produced by the malice of his enemies; their tumult was the natural effect of interest and of passion; and if Julian had tried to conceal a deep design under the appearances of chance, he must have employed the most consummate artifice without necessity, and probably without success. He solemnly declares, in the presence of Jupiter, of the Sun, of Mars, of Minerva, and of all the other deities, that, till the close of the evening which

[1] Even in this tumultuous moment, Julian attended to the forms of superstitious ceremony; and obstinately refused the inauspicious use of a female necklace, or a horse-collar, which the impatient soldiers would have employed in the room of a diadem.

[2] An equal proportion of gold and silver, five pieces of the former, one pound of the latter; the whole amounting to about five pounds ten shillings of our money.

[3] For the whole narrative of this revolt we may appeal to authentic and original materials; Julian himself (ad S. P. Q. Atheniens. p. 282.), Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 44. in Fabric. Bibliot. Græc. vii. p. 269.), Ammian. (xx. 4.), and Zos. (l. iii. 151.), who, in the reign of Julian, appears to follow the more respectable authority of Eunapius. With such guides, we *might* neglect the abbreviators and ecclesiastical historians.

[4] Eutrop., a respectable witness, uses a doubtful expression, "consensu militum" (x. 15.). Greg. Naz., whose ignorance might excuse his fanaticism, directly charges the apostate with presumption, madness, and impious rebellion, *αυθαδεια, απονοια, ασεβεια*. Orat. iii. 67.

preceded his elevation, he was utterly ignorant of the designs of the soldiers;[1] and it may seem ungenerous to distrust the honour of a hero, and the truth of a philosopher. Yet the superstitious confidence that Constantius was the enemy, and that he himself was the favourite, of the gods, might prompt him to desire, to solicit, and even to hasten the auspicious moment of his reign, which was predestined to restore the ancient religion of mankind. When Julian had received the intelligence of the conspiracy, he resigned himself to a short slumber; and afterwards related to his friends, that he had seen the Genius of the empire waiting with some impatience at his door, pressing for admittance, and reproaching his want of spirit and ambition.[2] Astonished and perplexed, he addressed his prayers to the great Jupiter; who immediately signified, by a clear and manifest omen, that he should submit to the will of heaven and of the army. The conduct which disclaims the ordinary maxims of reason, excites our suspicion and eludes our inquiry. Whenever the spirit of fanaticism, at once so credulous and so crafty, has insinuated itself into a noble mind, it insensibly corrodes the vital principles of virtue and veracity.

To moderate the zeal of his party, to protect the persons of his enemies,[3] to defeat and to despise the secret enterprises which were formed against his life and dignity, were the cares which employed the first days of the reign of the new Emperor. Although he was firmly resolved to maintain the station which he had assumed, he was still desirous of saving his country from the calamities of civil war, of declining a contest with the superior forces of Constantius, and of preserving his own character from the reproach of perfidy and ingratitude. Adorned with the ensigns of military and Imperial pomp, Julian showed himself in the field of Mars to the soldiers, who glowed with ardent enthusiasm in the cause of their pupil, their leader, and their friend. He recapitulated their victories, lamented their sufferings, applauded their resolution, animated their hopes, and checked their impetuosity; nor did he dismiss the assembly, till he had obtained a solemn promise from the troops, that if the emperor of the East would subscribe an equitable treaty, they would renounce any views of conquest, and satisfy themselves with the tranquil possession of the Gallic provinces. On this foundation he composed, in his own name, and in that of the army, a specious and moderate epistle,[4] which was delivered to Pentadius, his master of the offices, and to his chamberlain Eutherius; two ambassadors whom he appointed to receive the answer, and observe the dispositions of Constantius. This epistle is inscribed with the modest appellation of Cæsar; but Julian solicits in

[1] Julian. ad S. P. Q. Athen. p. 284. The *devout* Abbé de la Bleterie (Vie de Julien, p. 159.) is almost inclined to respect the *devout* protestations of a Pagan.

[2] Ammian. xx. 5. with the note of Lindenbrogius on the Genius of the empire. Julian himself, in a confidential letter to his friend and physician, Oribasian (Epist. xvii. 384.), mentions another dream, to which, before the event, he gave credit; of a stately tree thrown to the ground, of a small plant striking a deep root into the earth. Even in his sleep, the mind of the Cæsar must have been agitated by the hopes and fears of his fortune. Zos. (l. iii. 155.) relates a subsequent dream.

[3] The difficult situation of the prince of a rebellious army is finely described by Tacitus (Hist. i. 80.). But Otho had much more guilt, and much less abilities, than Julian.

[4] To this ostensible epistle he added, says Ammianus, private letters, objurgatorias et mordaces, which the historian had not seen, and would not have published. Perhaps they never existed.

a peremptory, though respectful manner, the confirmation of the title of Augustus. He acknowledges the irregularity of his own election, while he justifies, in some measure, the resentment and violence of the troops which had extorted his reluctant consent. He allows the supremacy of his brother Constantius; and engages to send him an annual present of Spanish horses, to recruit his army with a select number of Barbarian youths, and to accept from his choice a Pætorian præfect of approved discretion and fidelity. But he reserves for himself the nomination of his other civil and military officers, with the troops, the revenue, and the sovereignty of the provinces beyond the Alps. He admonishes the emperor to consult the dictates of justice; to distrust the arts of those venal flatterers, who subsist only by the discord of princes; and to embrace the offer of a fair and honourable treaty, equally advantageous to the republic, and to the house of Constantine. In this negociation Julian claimed no more than he already posesssed. The delegated authority which he had long exercised over the provinces of Gaul, Spain, and Britain, was still obeyed under a name more independent and august. The soldiers and the people rejoiced in a revolution which was not stained even with the blood of the guilty. Florentius was a fugitive; Lupicinus a prisoner. The persons who were disaffected to the new government were disarmed and secured; and the vacant offices were distributed, according to the recommendation of merit, by a prince, who despised the intrigues of the palace, and the clamours of the soldiers.[1]

The negociations of peace were accompanied and supported by the most vigorous preparations for war. The army, which Julian held in readiness for immediate action, was recruited and augmented by the disorders of the times. The cruel persecution of the faction of Magnentius had (A.D. 360, 361) filled Gaul with numerous bands of outlaws and robbers. They cheerfully accepted the offer of a general pardon from a prince whom they could trust, submitted to the restraints of military discipline, and retained only their implacable hatred to the person and government of Constantius.[2] As soon as the season of the year permitted Julian to take the field, he appeared at the head of his legions; threw a bridge over the Rhine in the neighbourhood of Cleves; and prepared to chastise the perfidy of the Attuarii, a tribe of Franks, who presumed that they might ravage, with impunity, the frontiers of a divided empire. The difficulty, as well as glory, of this enterprize, consisted in a laborious march; and Julian had conquered, as soon as he could penetrate into a country, which former princes had considered as inaccessible. After he had given peace to the Barbarians, the emperor carefully visited the fortifications along the Rhine from Cleves to Basil; surveyed, with peculiar attention, the territories which he had recovered from the hands of the Alemanni, passed through Besançon,[3] which had severely suffered

[1] First transactions of his reign, in Julian ad S. P. Q. Athen. p. 285, 286. Ammianus xx. 5. 8. Liban. Orat. Parent. c. 49, 50. p. 273.

[2] Liban. Orat. Parent. c. 50. p. 275. A strange disorder, since it continued above seven years. In the factions of the Greek republics, the exiles amounted to 20,000 persons, and Isocrates assures Philip, that it would be easier to raise an army from the vagabonds than from the cities. Hume's Essays, i. 426.

[3] Julian (Epist. xxxviii. 414.) gives a short description of Vesontia, or Besançon: a rocky peninsula almost encircled by the river Doux; once a magnificent city, filled with temples, &c. now reduced to a small town, emerging however from its ruins.

from their fury, and fixed his head-quarters at Vienna for the ensuing winter. The barrier of Gaul was improved and strengthened with additional fortifications; and Julian entertained some hopes, that the Germans, whom he had so often vanquished, might, in his absence, be restrained by the terror of his name. Vadomair[1] was the only prince of the Alemanni whom he esteemed or feared; and while the subtle Barbarian affected to observe the faith of treaties, the progress of his arms threatened the state with an unseasonable and dangerous war. The policy of Julian condescended to surprise the prince of the Alemanni by his own arts; and Vadomair, who, in the character of a friend, had incautiously accepted an invitation from the Roman governors, was seized in the midst of the entertainment, and sent away prisoner into the heart of Spain. Before the Barbarians were recovered from their amazement, the emperor appeared in arms on the banks of the Rhine, and, once more crossing the river, renewed the deep impressions of terror and respect which had been already made by four preceding expeditions.—*Ammianus* xx. 10. xxi. 3, 4. *Zosimus* l. iii. 155.

The ambassadors of Julian had been instructed to execute, with the utmost diligence, their important commission. But, in their passage through Italy and Illyricum, they were detained by the tedious and affected delays of the provincial governors; they were conducted by slow journeys from Constantinople to Cæsarea in Cappadocia; and when (A.D. 361) at length they were admitted to the presence of Constantius, they found that he had already conceived, from the dispatches of his own officers, the most unfavourable opinion of the conduct of Julian, and of the Gallic army. The letters were heard with impatience; the trembling messengers were dismissed with indignation and contempt; and the looks, the gestures, the furious language of the monarch, expressed the disorder of his soul. The domestic connexion, which might have reconciled the brother and the husband of Helena, was recently dissolved by the death of that princess, whose pregnancy had been several times fruitless, and was at last fatal to herself.[2] The empress Eusebia had preserved to the last moment of her life the warm, and even jealous, affection which she had conceived for Julian; and her mild influence might have moderated the resentment of a prince, who, since her death, was abandoned to his own passions, and to the arts of his eunuchs. But the terror of a foreign invasion obliged him to suspend the punishment of a private enemy; he continued his march towards the confines of Persia, and thought it sufficient to signify the conditions which might entitle Julian and his guilty followers to the clemency of their offended sovereign. He

[1] Vadomair entered into the Roman service, and was promoted from a Barbarian kingdom to the military rank of duke of Phœnicia. He still retained the same artful character (Ammianus xxi. 4.); but, under the reign of Valens, he signalized his valour in the Armenian war (xxix. 1.).

[2] Her remains were sent to Rome, and interred near those of her sister Constantina, in the suburb of the *Via Nomentana*. Ammian. xxi. 1. Libanius has composed a very weak apology to justify his hero from a very absurd charge; of poisoning his wife and rewarding her physician with his mother's jewels. (Seventh of 17 new orations, published at Venice 1754, from a MS. in St. Mark's library, p. 117.) Elpidius, the Prætorian præfect of the East, to whose evidence the accuser of Julian appeals, is arraigned by Libanus, as *effeminate* and ungrateful; yet the religion of Elpidius is praised by Jerom (i. 243.), and his humanity by Ammianus (xxi. 6.)

required, that the presumptuous Cæsar should expressly renounce the appellation and rank of Augustus, which he had accepted from the rebels ; that he should descend to his former station of a limited and dependent minister ; that he should vest the powers of the state and army in the hands of those officers who were appointed by the Imperial court ; and that he should trust his safety to the assurances of pardon, which were announced by Epictetus, a Gallic bishop, and one of the Arian favourites of Constantius. Several months were ineffectually consumed in a treaty which was negociated at the distance of 3000 miles between Paris and Antioch ; and, as soon as Julian perceived that his moderate and respectful behaviour served only to irritate the pride of an implacable adversary, he boldly resolved to commit his life and fortune to the chance of a civil war. He gave a public and military audience to the quæstor Leonas : the haughty epistle of Constantius was read to the attentive multitude ; and Julian protested, with the most flattering deference, that he was ready to resign the title of Augustus, if he could obtain the consent of those whom he acknowledged as the authors of his elevation. The faint proposal was impetuously silenced ; and the acclamations of "Julian Augustus, continue to reign, by the authority of the army, of the people, of the republic, which you have saved," thundered at once from every part of the field, and terrified the pale ambassador of Constantius. A part of the letter was afterwards read, in which the emperor arraigned the ingratitude of Julian, whom he had invested with the honours of the purple ; whom he had educated with so much care and tenderness ; whom he had preserved in his infancy, when he was left a helpless orphan. "An orphan !" interrupted Julian, who justified his cause by indulging his passions : "Does the assassin of my family reproach me that I was left an orphan ? He urges me to revenge those injuries which I have long studied to forget." The assembly was dismissed ; and Leonas, who, with some difficulty, had been protected from the popular fury, was sent back to his master, with an epistle, in which Julian expressed, in a strain of the most vehement eloquence, the sentiments of contempt, of hatred, and of resentment, which had been suppressed and embittered by the dissimulation of twenty years. After this message, which might be considered as a signal of irreconcileable war, Julian, who, some weeks before, had celebrated the Christian festival of the Epiphany,[1] made a public declaration that he committed the care of his safety to the IMMORTAL GODS ; and thus publicly renounced the religion, as well as the friendship, of Constantius.[2]

[1] Feriarum die quem celebrantes mense Januario, Christiani *Epiphania* dictitant, progressus in eorum ecclesiam, solemniter numine orato discessit. Ammian. xxii. 2. Zonaras observes, that it was on Christmas-day, and his assertion is not inconsistent ; since the churches of Egypt, Asia, and perhaps Gaul, celebrated on the same day (the sixth of January), the nativity and the baptism of their Saviour. The Romans, as ignorant as their brethren of the real date of his birth, fixed the solemn festival to the 25th of December, the *Brumalia*, or winter solstice, when the Pagans annually celebrated the birth of the Sun. Bingham's Antiqit. Christ. Church, l. xx. c. 4. and Beausobre Hist. Crit. du Manich. ii. 690.

[2] The public and secret negociations between Constantius and Julian, must be extracted with some caution, from Julian himself (Orat. ad S. P. Q. Athen. p. 286.), Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 51. p. 276.), Ammian. (xx. 9.), Zos. (l. iii. 154.), and even Zonaras (ii. l. xiii. 20.), who, on this occasion, appears to have possessed and used some valuable materials.

The situation of Julian required a vigorous and immediate resolution. He had discovered, from intercepted letters, that his adversary, sacrificing the interest of the state to that of the monarch, had again excited the Barbarians to invade the provinces of the West. The position of two magazines, one of them collected on the banks of the lake of Constance, the other formed at the foot of the Cottian Alps, seemed to indicate the march of two armies; and the size of those magazines, each of which consisted of six hundred thousand quarters of wheat, or rather flour,[1] was a threatening evidence of the strength and numbers of the enemy, who prepared to surround him. But the Imperial legions were still in their distant quarters of Asia; the Danube was feebly guarded; and if Julian could occupy, by a sudden incursion, the important provinces of Illyricum, he might expect that a people of soldiers would resort to his standard, and that the rich mines of gold and silver would contribute to the expences of the civil war. He proposed this bold enterprise to the assembly of the soldiers; inspired them with a just confidence in their general, and in themselves; and exhorted them to maintain their reputation, of being terrible to the enemy, moderate to their fellow-citizens, and obedient to their officers. His spirited discourse was received with the loudest acclamations, and the same troops which had taken up arms against Constantius, when he summoned them to leave Gaul, now declared with alacrity, that they would follow Julian to the farthest extremities of Europe or Asia. The oath of fidelity was administered; and the soldiers, clashing their shields, and pointing their drawn swords to their throats, devoted themselves, with horrid imprecations, to the service of a leader whom they celebrated as the deliverer of Gaul, and the conqueror of the Germans.—*Oration*, and behaviour of the troops, *Ammian.* xxi. 5. This solemn engagement, which seemed to be dictated by affection, rather than by duty, was singly opposed by Nebridius, who had been admitted to the office of Prætorian præfect. That faithful minister, alone and unassisted, asserted the rights of Constantius in the midst of an armed and angry multitude, to whose fury he had almost fallen an honourable, but useless, sacrifice. After losing one of his hands by the stroke of a sword, he embraced the knees of the prince whom he had offended. Julian covered the præfect with his Imperial mantle, and protecting him from the zeal of his followers, dismissed him to his own house, with less respect than was perhaps due to the virtue of an enemy.[2] The high office of Nebridius was bestowed on Sallust; and the provinces of Gaul, which were now delivered from the intolerable oppression of taxes, enjoyed the mild and equitable administration of the friend of Julian, who was permitted to practise those virtues which he had instilled into the mind of his pupil.[3]

[1] 300 myriads, or 3,000,000 of *medimni*, a corn-measure familiar to the Athenians, and which contained six Roman *modii*. Julian explains, like a soldier and a statesman, the danger of his situation, and the necessity and advantages of an offensive war (ad S. P. Q. Athen. p. 286, 287.).

[2] He sternly refused his hand to the suppliant præfect, whom he sent into Tuscany (Ammian. xxi. 5.). Libanius, with savage fury, insults Nebridius, applauds the soldiers, and almost censures the humanity of Julian (Orat. Parent. c. 53. p. 278.).

[3] Ammian. xxi. 8. In this promotion, Julian obeyed the law which he publicly imposed on himself. Neque civilis quisquam judex nec militaris rector, alio quodam præter merita suffragante, ad potiorum veniat gradum (Ammian. xx. 5.). Absence did not weaken his regard for Sallust, with whose name (A.D. 363.) he honoured the consulship.

The hopes of Julian depended much less on the number of his troops, than on the celerity of his motions. In the execution of a daring enterprise, he availed himself of every precaution, as far as prudence could suggest; and where prudence could no longer accompany his steps, he trusted the event to valour and to fortune. In the neighbourhood of Basil he assembled and divided his army.[1] One body, which consisted of 10,000 men, was directed, under the command of Nevitta, general of the cavalry, to advance through the midland parts of Rhætia and Noricum. A similar division of troops, under the orders of Jovius and Jovinus, prepared to follow the oblique course of the highways, through the Alps and the northern confines of Italy. The instructions to the generals were conceived with energy and precision: to hasten their march in close and compact columns, which, according to the disposition of the ground, might readily be changed into any order of battle; to secure themselves against the surprises of the night by strong posts and vigilant guards; to prevent resistance by their unexpected arrival; to elude examination by their sudden departure; to spread the opinion of their strength, and the terror of his name; and to join their sovereign under the walls of Sirmium. For himself, Julian had reserved a more difficult and extraordinary part. He selected 3000 brave and active volunteers, resolved, like their leader, to cast behind them every hope of a retreat: at the head of this faithful band, he fearlessly plunged into the recesses of the Marcian, or black forest, which conceals the sources of the Danube;[2] and for many days, the fate of Julian was unknown to the world. The secrecy of his march, his diligence, and vigour, surmounted every obstacle; he forced his way over mountains and morasses, occupied the bridges or swam the rivers, pursued his direct course,[3] without reflecting whether he traversed the territory of the Romans or of the Barbarians, and at length emerged, between Ratisbon and Vienna, at the place where he designed to embark his troops on the Danube. By a well-concerted stratagem, he seized a fleet of light brigantines,[4] as it lay at anchor; secured a supply of coarse provisions sufficient to satisfy the indelicate, but voracious, appetite of a Gallic army; and boldly committed himself to the stream of the Danube. The labours of his mariners, who plied their oars with incessant diligence, and the steady continuance of a favourable wind, carried his fleet above 700 miles in 11 days;[5] and he had already dis-

[1] Ammian. (xxi. 8.) ascribes the same practice, and the same motive, to Alexander the Great, and other skilful generals.

[2] This wood was a part of the great Hercynian forest, which, in the time of Cæsar, stretched away from the country of the Rauraci (Basil) into the boundless regions of the North. Cluver. German. Antiq. l. iii. c. 47.

[3] Compare Liban. Orat. Parent. c. 53. p. 278, with Greg. Nazianzen, Orat. iii. p. 68. Even the saint admires the speed and secrecy of this march. A modern divine might apply to the progress of Julian, the lines which were originally designed for another apostate:

——————So eagerly the fiend,
O'er bog, or steep, through strait, rough, dense, or rare,
With head, hands, wings, or feet, pursues his way,
And swims, or sinks; or wades, or creeps, or flies.—MILTON.

[4] In that interval the *Notitia* places two or three fleets, the Lauriacensis (at Lauriacum, or Lorch), the Arlapensis, the Maginensis; and mentions five legions, or cohorts, of Liburnarii, who should be a sort of marines. Sect. lviii. edit. Labb.

[5] Zosimus alone (l. iii. 156.) has specified this interesting circumstance. Mamertinus (in

embarked his troops at Bononia, only 19 miles from Sirmium, before his enemies could receive any certain intelligence that he had left the banks of the Rhine. In the course of this long and rapid navigation, the mind of Julian was fixed on the object of his enterprise ; and though he accepted the deputation of some cities, which hastened to claim the merit of an early submission, he passed before the hostile stations, which were placed along the river, without indulging the temptation of signalizing an useless and ill-timed valour. The banks of the Danube were crowded on either side with spectators, who gazed on the military pomp, anticipated the importance of the event, and diffused through the adjacent country the fame of a young hero, who advanced with more than mortal speed at the head of the innumerable forces of the West. Lucilian, who, with the rank of general of the cavalry, commanded the military powers of Illyricum, was alarmed and perplexed by the doubtful reports, which he could neither reject nor believe. He had taken some slow and irresolute measures for the purpose of collecting his troops ; when he was surprised by Dagalaiphus, an active officer, whom Julian, as soon as he landed at Bononia, had pushed forwards with some light infantry. The captive general, uncertain of his life or death, was hastily thrown upon a horse, and conducted to the presence of Julian ; who kindly raised him from the ground, and dispelled the terror and amazement which seemed to stupify his faculties. But Lucilian had no sooner recovered his spirits, than he betrayed his want of discretion, by presuming to admonish his conqueror, that he had rashly ventured, with a handful of men, to expose his person in the midst of his enemies. "Reserve for your "master Constantius these timid remonstrances," replied Julian, with a smile of contempt ; "when I gave you my purple to kiss, I received "you not as a counsellor, but as a suppliant." Conscious that success alone could justify his attempt, and that boldness only could command success, he instantly advanced, at the head of 3000 soldiers, to attack the strongest and most populous city of the Illyrian provinces. As he entered the long suburb of Sirmium, he was received by the joyful acclamations of the army and people ; who, crowned with flowers, and holding lighted tapers in their hands, conducted their acknowledged sovereign to his Imperial residence. Two days were devoted to the public joy, which was celebrated by the games of the Circus ; but, early on the morning of the third day, Julian marched to occupy the narrow pass of Succi, in the defiles of Mount Hæmus ; which, almost in the mid-way between Sirmium and Constantinople, separates the provinces of Thrace and Dacia, by an abrupt descent towards the former, and a gentle declivity on the side of the latter.[1] The defence of this important post was entrusted to the brave Nevitta ; who, as well as the generals of the Italian division, successfully executed the

Paneg. Vet. xi. 6.), who accompanied Julian, as count of the sacred largesses, describes this voyage in a florid and picturesque manner, challenges Triptolemus and the Argonauts of Greece, &c.

[1] The description of Ammianus, which might be supported by collateral evidence, ascertains the precise situation of the *Angustiæ Succorum*, or passes of *Succi*. M. d'Anville, from the trifling resemblance of names, has placed them between Sardica and Naissus. For my own justification, I am obliged to mention the *only* error which I have discovered in the maps or writings of that admirable geographer.

plan of the march and junction which their master had so ably conceived.[1]

The homage which Julian obtained, from the fears or the inclination of the people, extended far beyond the immediate effect of his arms.[2] The præfectures of Italy and Illyricum were administered by Taurus and Florentius, who united that important office with the vain honours of the consulship; and as those magistrates had retired with precipitation to the court of Asia, Julian, who could not always restrain the levity of his temper, stigmatized their flight by adding, in all the Acts of the Year, the epithet of *fugitive* to the names of the two consuls. The provinces which had been deserted by their first magistrates acknowledged the authority of an emperor, who conciliating the qualities of a soldier with those of a philosopher, was equally admired in the camps of the Danube, and in the cities of Greece. From his palace, or, more properly, from his head-quarters of Sirmium and Naissus, he distributed to the principal cities of the empire, a laboured apology for his own conduct; published the secret dispatches of Constantius; and solicited the judgment of mankind between two competitors, the one of whom had expelled, and the other had invited, the Barbarians.[3] Julian, whose mind was deeply wounded by the reproach of ingratitude, aspired to maintain, by argument, as well as by arms, the superior merits of his cause; and to excel, not only in the arts of war, but in those of composition. His epistle to the senate and people of Athens[4] seems to have been dictated by an elegant enthusiasm; which prompted him to submit his actions and his motives to the degenerate Athenians of his own times, with the same humble deference, as if he had been pleading, in the days of Aristides, before the tribunal of the Areopagus. His application to the senate of Rome, which was still permitted to bestow the titles of Imperial power, was agreeable to the forms of the expiring republic. An assembly was summoned by Tertullus, præfect of the city; the epistle of Julian was read; and as he appeared to be master of Italy, his claims were admitted without a dissenting voice. His oblique censure of the innovations of Constantine, and his passionate invective against the vices of Constantius, were heard with less satisfaction; and the senate, as if Julian had been present, unanimously exclaimed, "Respect, we beseech you, the author "of your own fortune."[5] An artful expression, which, according to the chance of war, might be differently explained; as a manly reproof of the ingratitude of the usurper, or as a flattering confession, that a

[1] Whatever circumstances we may borrow elsewhere, Ammian. (xxi. 8.) still supplies the series of the narrative.

[2] Ammian. xxi. 9, 10. Liban. Orat. Parent. c. 54. p. 279. Zos. l. iii. 156.

[3] Julian (ad S. P. Q. Athen. p. 286.) positively asserts, that he intercepted the letters of Constantius to the Barbarians: and Libanius as positively affirms, that he had read them on his march to the troops and the cities. Yet Ammianus (xxi. 4.) expresses himself with cool and candid hesitation, si *famæ solius* admittenda est fides. He specifies, however, an intercepted letter from Vadomair to Constantius, which supposes an intimate correspondence between them: "Cæsar tuus disciplinam non habet."

[4] Zosimus mentions his epistles to the Athenians, the Corinthians, and the Lacedæmonians. The substance was probably the same, though the address was properly varied. The epistle to the Athenians is still extant (p. 268—287.), and has afforded much valuable information. It deserves the praises of La Bleterie (Pref. à l'Hist. de Jov. p. 24.), and is one of the best manifestoes to be found in any language.

[5] *Auctori tuo reverentiam rogamus.* Ammian. xxi. 10. It is amusing enough to observe the secret conflicts of the senate between flattery and fear. Tacit. Hist. i. 85.

single act of such benefit to the state ought to atone for all the failings of Constantius.

The intelligence of the march and rapid progress of Julian was speedily transmitted to his rival, who, by the retreat of Sapor, had obtained some respite from the Persian war. Disguising the anguish of his soul under the semblance of contempt, Constantius professed his intention of returning into Europe, and of giving chace to Julian; for he never spoke of this military expedition in any other light than that of a hunting party.[1] In the camp of Hierapolis, in Syria, he communicated this design to his army; slightly mentioned the guilt and rashness of the Cæsar; and ventured to assure them, that if the mutineers of Gaul presumed to meet them in the field, they would be unable to sustain the fire of their eyes, and the irresistible weight of their shout of onset. The speech of the emperor was received with military applause, and Theodotus, the president of the council of Hierapolis, requested, with tears of adulation, that *his* city might be adorned with the head of the vanquished rebel.[2] A chosen detachment was dispatched away in post-waggons, to secure, if it were yet possible, the pass of Succi; the recruits, the horses, the arms, and the magazines which had been prepared against Sapor, were appropriated to the service of the civil war; and the domestic victories of Constantius inspired his partisans with the most sanguine assurances of success. The notary Gaudentius had occupied in his name the provinces of Africa; the subsistence of Rome was intercepted; and the distress of Julian was increased, by an unexpected event, which might have been productive of fatal consequences. Julian had received the submission of two legions and a cohort of archers, who were stationed at Sirmium; but he suspected, with reason, the fidelity of those troops, which had been distinguished by the emperor; and it was thought expedient, under the pretence of the exposed state of the Gallic frontier, to dismiss them from the most important scene of action. They advanced, with reluctance, as far as the confines of Italy; but as they dreaded the length of the way, and the savage fierceness of the Germans, they resolved, by the instigation of one of their tribunes, to halt at Aquileia, and to erect the banners of Constantius on the walls of that impregnable city. The vigilance of Julian perceived at once the extent of the mischief, and the necessity of applying an immediate remedy. By his order, Jovinus led back a part of the army into Italy; and the siege of Aquileia was formed with diligenee, and prosecuted with vigour. But the legionaries, who seemed to have rejected the yoke of discipline, conducted the defence of the place with skill and perseverance; invited the rest of Italy to imitate the example of their courage and loyalty; and threatened the retreat of Julian, if he should be forced to yield to the superior numbers of the armies of the East.[3]

[1] Tanquam venaticiam prædam caperet: hoc enim ad leniendum suorum metum subinde prædicabat. Ammian. xxi. 7.

[2] See the speech and preparations in Ammian. xxi. 13. The vile Theodotus afterwards implored and obtained his pardon from the merciful conqueror, who signified his wish of diminishing his enemies, and increasing the number of his friends (xxii. 14.).

[3] Ammian. xxi. 7. 11, 12. He seems to describe, with superfluous labour, the operations of the siege of Aquileia, which, on this occasion, maintained its impregnable fame. Greg. Nazianzen (Orat. iii. p. 68.) ascribes this accidental revolt to the wisdom of Constantius, whose assured victory he announces with some appearance of truth. Constantio quem

But the humanity of Julian was preserved from the cruel alternative, which he pathetically laments, of destroying, or of being himself destroyed: and the seasonable death of Constantius delivered the Roman empire from the calamities of civil war. The approach of winter could not detain the monarch at Antioch; and his favourites durst not oppose his impatient desire of revenge. A slight fever, which was perhaps occasioned by the agitation of his spirits, was increased by the fatigues of the journey; and Constantius was obliged to halt at the little town of Mopsucrene, 12 miles beyond Tarsus, where he expired, after a short illness, in the forty-fifth year of his age, and the twenty-fourth of his reign (A.D. 361 Nov. 3).[1] His genuine character, which was composed of pride and weakness, of superstition and cruelty, has been fully displayed in the preceding narrative of civil and ecclesiastical events. The long abuse of power rendered him a considerable object in the eyes of his contemporaries; but as personal merit can alone deserve the notice of posterity, the last of the sons of Constantine may be dismissed from the world with the remark, that he inherited the defects, without the abilities, of his father. Before Constantius expired, he is said to have named Julian for his successor; nor does it seem improbable, that his anxious concern for the fate of a young and tender wife, whom he left with child, may have prevailed, in his last moments, over the harsher passions of hatred and revenge. Eusebius, and his guilty associates, made a faint attempt to prolong the reign of the eunuchs, by the election of another emperor: but their intrigues were rejected with disdain by an army which now abhorred the thought of civil discord; and two officers of rank were instantly dispatched, to assure Julian, that every sword in the empire would be drawn for his service. The military designs of that prince, who had formed three different attacks against Thrace, were prevented by this fortunate event. Without shedding the blood of his fellow-citizens, he escaped the dangers of a doubtful conflict, and acquired the advantages of a complete victory. Impatient to visit the place of his birth, and the new capital of the empire, he advanced from Naissus through the mountains of Hæmus, and the cities of Thrace. When he reached Heraclea, at the distance of 60 miles, all Constantinople was poured forth to receive him; and he made his triumphal entry (Dec. 11), amidst the dutiful acclamations of the soldiers, the people, and the senate. An innumerable multitude pressed around him with eager respect; and were perhaps disappointed when they beheld the small stature, and simple garb, of a hero, whose unexperienced youth had vanquished the Barbarians of Germany, and who had now traversed, in a successful career, the whole continent of Europe, from the shores of the Atlantic to those of the Bosphorus.[2] A few days afterwards,

credebat procul dubio fore victorem: nemo enim omnium tunc ab hac constanti sententia discrepebat. Ammian. xxi. 7.

[1] His death and character are faithfully delineated by Ammian. (xxi. 14.); and we are authorised to despise and detest the foolish calumny of Gregory (Orat. iii. p. 68.), who accuses Julian of contriving the death of his benefactor. The private repentance of the emperor, that he had spared and promoted Julian (p. 69. and Orat. xxi. p. 389.), is not improbable in itself, nor incompatible with the public verbal testament, which prudential considerations might dictate in the last moments of his life.

[2] In describing the triumph of Julian, Ammian. (xxii. 1, 2.) assumes the lofty tone of an

when the remains of the deceased emperor were landed in the harbour, the subjects of Julian applauded the real or affected humanity of their sovereign. On foot, without his diadem, and clothed in a mourning habit, he accompanied the funeral as far as the church of the Holy Apostles, where the body was deposited: and if these marks of respect may be interpreted as a selfish tribute to the birth and dignity of his Imperial kinsman, the tears of Julian professed to the world, that he had forgot the injuries, and remembered only the obligations, which he had received from Constantius.[1] As soon as the legions of Aquileia were assured of the death of the emperor, they opened the gates of the city, and, by the sacrifice of their guilty leaders, obtained an easy pardon from the prudence or lenity of Julian; who, in the thirty-second year of his age, acquired the undisputed possession of the Roman empire.[2]

Philosophy had instructed Julian to compare the advantages of action and retirement; but the elevation of his birth, and the accidents of his life, never allowed him the freedom of choice. He might perhaps sincerely have preferred the groves of the Academy, and the society of Athens; but he was constrained, at first by the will, and afterwards by the injustice, of Constantius, to expose his person and fame to the dangers of Imperial greatness; and to make himself accountable to the world, and to posterity, for the happiness of millions.[3] Julian recollected with terror the observation of his master Plato,[4] that the government of our flocks and herds is always committed to beings of a superior species; and that the conduct of nations requires and deserves the celestial powers of the Gods or of the Genii. From this principle he justly concluded, that the man who presumes to reign, should aspire to the perfection of the divine nature; that he should purify his soul from her mortal and terrestrial part; that he should extinguish his appetites, enlighten his understanding, regulate his passions, and subdue the wild beast, which, according to the lively metaphor of Aristotle,[5] seldom fails to ascend the throne of a despot. The throne of Julian, which the death of Constantius fixed on an independent basis, was the seat of reason, of virtue, and perhaps of vanity. He despised the honours, renounced the pleasures, and discharged with incessant diligence the duties, of his exalted station; and

orator or poet; while Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 56. p. 281.) sinks to the grave simplicity of an historian.

[1] The funeral of Constantius is described by Ammian. (xxi. 16.), Greg. Nazianzen (Orat. iv. p. 119.), Mamert. (in Panegyr. Vet. xi. 27.), Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. lvi. 283.), and Philostor. (l. vi. c. 6. with Godefroy's Dissertations, p. 265.). These writers, and their followers, Pagans, Catholics, Arians, beheld with very different eyes both the dead and the living emperor.

[2] The day and year of the birth of Julian are not perfectly ascertained. The day is probably Nov. 6, and the year must be either 331 or 332. Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. iv. 693. Ducange, Fam. Byzantin. p. 50. I have preferred the earlier date.

[3] Julian himself (p. 253.) has expressed these philosophical ideas, with much eloquence, and some affectation, in a very elaborate epistle to Themistius. The Abbé de la Bleterie (ii. 146.), who has given an elegant translation, is inclined to believe that it was the celebrated Themistius, whose orations are still extant.

[4] Julian ad Themist. p. 258. Petavius (not. p. 95.) observes, that this passage is taken from the fourth book de Legibus; but either Julian quoted from memory, or his MSS. were different from ours. Xenophon opens the Cyropædia with a similar reflection.

[5] Ο δε ανθρωπον κελευων αρχειν, προστιθησι και θηριον. Aristot. ap. Julian. p. 261. The MS. of Vossius, unsatisfied with a single beast, affords the stronger reading of θηρια, which the experience of despotism may warrant.

there were few among his subjects who would have consented to relieve him from the weight of the diadem, had they been obliged to submit their time and their actions to the rigorous laws which their philosophic emperor imposed on himself. One of his most intimate friends,[1] who had often shared the frugal simplicity of his table, has remarked, that his light and sparing diet (which was usually of the vegetable kind) left his mind and body always free and active, for the various and important business of an author, a pontiff, a magistrate, a general, a prince. In one and the same day, he gave audience to several ambassadors, and wrote, or dictated, a great number of letters to his generals, his civil magistrates, his private friends, and the different cities of his dominions. He listened to the memorials which had been received, considered the subject of the petitions, and signified his intentions more rapidly than they could be taken in short-hand by the diligence of his secretaries. He possessed such flexibility of thought, and such firmness of attention, that he could employ his hand to write, his ear to listen, and his voice to dictate; and pursue at once three several trains of idea without hesitation, and without error. While his ministers reposed, the prince flew with agility from one labour to another, and, after a hasty dinner, retired into his library, till the public business, which he had appointed for the evening, summoned him to interrupt the prosecution of his studies. The supper of the emperor was still less substantial than the former meal; his sleep was never clouded by the fumes of indigestion; and, except in the short interval of a marriage, which was the effect of policy rather than love, the chaste Julian never shared his bed with a female companion.[2] He was soon awakened by the entrance of fresh secretaries, who had slept the preceding day; and his servants were obliged to wait alternately, while their indefatigable master allowed himself scarcely any other refreshment than the change of occupations. The predecessors of Julian, his uncle, his brother, and his cousin, indulged their puerile taste for the games of the Circus, under the specious pretence of complying with the inclinations of the people; and they frequently remained the greatest part of the day, as idle spectators, and as a part of the splendid spectacle, till the ordinary round of twenty-four races[3] was completely finished. On solemn festivals, Julian, who felt and professed an unfashionable dislike to these frivolous amusements, condescended to appear in the Circus; and after bestowing a careless glance on five or six of the races, he hastily withdrew, with the impatience of a philosopher, who considered every moment as lost that was not devoted to the advantage of the public,

[1] Liban. (Orat, Parent. c. lxxxiv. lxxxv. p. 310.) has given this interesting detail of the private life of Julian. He himself (in Misopogon, p. 350.) mentions his vegetable diet, and upbraids the gross and sensual appetite of the people of Antioch.

[2] The chastity of Julian is confirmed by the impartial testimony of Ammian. (xxv. 4.), and the partial silence of the Christians.

[3] Salmasius ad Sueton. in Claud. c. xxi. A twenty-fifth race, or *missus*, was added, to complete the number of 100 chariots, 4 of which, the 4 colours, started each heat.

Centum quadrijugos agitabo ad flumina currus.

It appears, that they ran 5 or 7 times round the *Meta* (Sueton. in Domitian, c. 4.); and (from the measure of the Circus Maximus at Rome, the Hippodrome at Constantinople, &c.) it might be about a 4-mile course.

or the improvement of his own mind.[1] By this avarice of time, he seemed to protract the short duration of his reign; and if the dates were less securely ascertained, we should refuse to believe, that only sixteen months elapsed (Dec. A.D. 361. Mar. A.D. 363.) between the death of Constantius and the departure of his successor for the Persian war. The actions of Julian can only be preserved by the care of the historian; but the portion of his voluminous writings, which is still extant, remains as a monument of the application, as well as of the genius, of the emperor. The Misopogon, the Cæsars, several of his orations, and his elaborate work against the Christian religion, were composed in the long nights of the two winters, the former of which he passed at Constantinople, and the latter at Antioch.

The reformation of the Imperial court was one of the first and most necessary acts of the government of Julian.[2] Soon after his entrance into the palace of Constantinople, he had occasion for the service of a barber. An officer, magnificently dressed, immediately presented himself. "It is a barber," exclaimed the prince, with affected surprise, "that I want, and not a receiver-general of the finances."[3] He questioned the man concerning the profits of employment; and was informed, that besides a large salary, and some valuable perquisites, he enjoyed a daily allowance for twenty servants, and as many horses. A thousand barbers, a thousand cup-bearers, a thousand cooks, were distributed in the several offices of luxury; and the number of eunuchs could be compared only with the insects of a summer's day.[4] The monarch who resigned to his subjects the superiority of merit and virtue, was distinguished by the oppressive magnificence of his dress, his table, his buildings, and his train. The stately palaces erected by Constantine and his sons, were decorated with many-coloured marbles, and ornaments of massy gold. The most exquisite dainties were procured, to gratify their pride, rather than their taste; birds of the most distant climates, fish from the most remote seas, fruits out of their natural season, winter roses, and summer snows.[5] The domestic crowd of the palace surpassed the expence of the legions; yet the smallest part of this costly multitude was subservient to the use, or even to the splendour, of the throne. The monarch was disgraced, and the people was injured, by the creation and sale of an infinite number of obscure and

[1] Julian. in Misopogon, p. 340. Julius Cæsar had offended the Roman people by reading his dispatches during the actual race. Augustus indulged their taste, or his own, by his constant attention to the important business of the Circus, for which he professed the warmest inclination. Sueton. in August. c. xlv.

[2] The reformation of the palace is described by Ammian. (xxii. 4.), Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. lxii. p. 288.), Mamertin. (in Paneg. Vet. xi. 11.), Socr. (l. iii. c. 1.), and Zonaras (tom. ii. l. xiii. 24.).

[3] Ego non *rationalem* jussi sed tonsorem acciri. Zonaras uses the less natural image of a *senator*. Yet an officer of the finances, who was satisfied with wealth, might desire and obtain the honours of the senate.

[4] Μαγειρους μεν χιλιους, κουρεας δε ουκ ουλαττους, οινοχοους δε πλειους, σμηνη τραπεζοποιων, ευνουχους υπερ τας μυιας παρα τοις ποιμεσι εν ηρι, are the original words of Libanius, which I have faithfully quoted, lest I should be suspected of magnifying the abuses of the royal household.

[5] The expressions of Mamertinus are lively and forcible. Quin etiam prandiorum et cænarum laboratas magnitudines Romanus populus sensit; cum quæsitissimæ dapes non gustu sed difficultatibus æstimarentur; miracula avium, longinqui maris pisces, alieni temporis poma, æstivæ nives, hybernæ rosæ.

even titular employments ; and the most worthless of mankind might purchase the privilege of being maintained, without the necessity of labour, from the public revenue. The waste of an enormous household, the increase of fees and perquisites, which were soon claimed as a lawful debt, and the bribes which they extorted from those who feared their enmity, or solicited their favour, suddenly enriched these haughty menials. They abused their fortune, without considering their past, or their future, condition ; and their rapine and venality could be equalled only by the extravagance of their dissipations. Their silken robes were embroidered with gold, their tables were served with delicacy and profusion ; the houses which they built for their own use, would have covered the farm of an ancient consul ; and the most honourable citizens were obliged to dismount from their horses, and respectfully to salute an eunuch whom they met on the public highway. The luxury of the palace excited the contempt and indignation of Julian, who usually slept on the ground, who yielded with reluctance to the indispensable calls of nature ; and who placed his vanity, not in emulating, but in despising, the pomp of royalty. By the total extirpation of a mischief which was magnified even beyond its real extent, he was impatient to relieve the distress, and to appease the murmurs, of the people ; who support with less uneasiness the weight of taxes, if they are convinced that the fruits of their industry are appropriated to the service of the state. But in the execution of this salutary work, Julian is accused of proceeding with too much haste and inconsiderate severity. By a single edict, he reduced the palace of Constantinople to an immense desert, and dismissed with ignominy the whole train of slaves and dependents,[1] without providing any just, or at least benevolent, exceptions, for the age, the services, or the poverty, of the faithful domestics of the Imperial family. Such indeed was the temper of Julian, who seldom recollected the fundamental maxim of Aristotle, that true virtue is placed at an equal distance between the opposite vices. The splendid and effeminate dress of the Asiatics, the curls and paint, the collars and bracelets, which had appeared so ridiculous in the person of Constantine, were consistently rejected by his philosophic successor. But with the fopperies, Julian affected to renounce the decencies, of dress ; and seemed to value himself for his neglect of the laws of cleanliness. In a satirical performance, which was designed for the public eye, the emperor descants with pleasure, and even with pride, on the length of his nails, and the inky blackness of his hands ; protests, that although the greatest part of his body was covered with hair, the use of the razor was confined to his head alone ; and celebrates, with visible complacency, the shaggy and *populous*[2] beard, which he fondly

[1] Yet Julian himself was accused of bestowing whole towns on the eunuchs (Orat. vii. against Polyclet. p. 117—127.). Libanius contents himself with a cold but positive denial of the fact, which seems indeed to belong more properly to Constantius. This charge, however, may allude to some unknown circumstance.

[2] In the Misopogon (p. 338.) he draws a very singular picture of himself, and the following words are strangely characteristic ; *αυτος προσεθεικα τον βαθυν τουτονι πωγωνα . . . ταυτα τοι διαθεοντων ανεχομαι των φθειρων οσπερ εν λοχμη των θηριων.* The friends of the Abbé de la Bleterie adjured him, in the name of the French nation, not to translate this passage, so offensive to their delicacy (Hist. de Jovien, ii. 94.). Like him, I

cherished, after the example of the philosophers of Greece. Had Julian consulted the simple dictates of reason, the first magistrate of the Romans would have scorned the affectation of Diogenes, as well as that of Darius.

But the work of public reformation would have remained imperfect, if Julian had only corrected the abuses, without punishing the crimes, of his predecessor's reign. "We are now delivered," says he, in a familiar letter to one of his intimate friends, "we are now surprisingly "delivered from the voracious jaws of the Hydra.[1] I do not mean to "apply that epithet to my brother Constantius. He is no more; may "the earth lie light on his head! But his artful and cruel favourites "studied to deceive and exasperate a prince, whose natural mildness "cannot be praised without some efforts of adulation. It is not, how-"ever, my intention, that even those men should be oppressed: they "are accused, and they shall enjoy the benefit of a fair and impartial "trial." To conduct this enquiry, Julian named six judges of the highest rank in the state and army; and as he wished to escape the reproach of condemning his personal enemies, he fixed this extraordinary tribunal at Chalcedon, on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus; and transferred to the commissioners an absolute power to pronounce and execute their final sentence, without delay, and without appeal. The office of president was exercised by the venerable præfect of the East, a *second* Sallust,[2] whose virtues conciliated the esteem of Greek sophists, and of Christian bishops. He was assisted by the eloquent Mamertinus,[3] one of the consuls elect, whose merit is loudly celebrated by the doubtful evidence of his own applause. But the civil wisdom of two magistrates was overbalanced by the ferocious violence of four generals, Nevitta, Agilo, Jovinus, and Arbetio. Arbetio, whom the public would have seen with less surprise at the bar than on the bench, was supposed to possess the secret of the commission; the armed and angry leaders of the Jovian and Herculian bands encompassed the tribunal; and the judges were alternately swayed by the laws of justice, and by the clamours of faction.[4]

The chamberlain Eusebius, who had so long abused the favour of Constantius, expiated, by an ignominious death, the insolence, the corruption, and cruelty of his servile reign. The executions of Paul and Apodemius (the former of whom was burnt alive) were accepted as an inadequate atonement by the widows and orphans of so many hundred Romans, whom those legal tyrants had betrayed and mur-

have contented myself with a transient allusion; but the little animal, which Julian *names*, is a beast familiar to man, and signifies love.

[1] Julian, epist. xxiii. 389. He uses the words πολυκεφαλον ὑδραν, in writing to his friend Hermogenes, who, like himself, was conversant with the Greek poets.

[2] The two Sallusts, the præfect of Gaul, and the præfect of the East, must be carefully distinguished (Hist. des Emp. iv. 696.). I have used the surname of *Secundus*, as a convenient epithet. The second Sallust extorted the esteem of the Christians themselves; and Greg Nazianzen, who condemned his religion, has celebrated his virtues (Orat. iii. 90.). See a curious note of the Abbé de la Bleterie, Vie de Julien, p. 363.

[3] Mamertinus praises the emperor (xi. 1.) for bestowing the offices of Treasurer and Præfect on a man of wisdom, firmness, integrity, &c. like himself. Yet Ammian ranks him (xxi. 1.) among the ministers of Julian, quorum merita nôrat et fidem.

[4] The proceedings of this chamber of justice are related by Ammian. (xxii. 3.). and praised by Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 74. p. 299.)

dered. But Justice herself (if we may use the pathetic expression of Ammianus [1]) appeared to weep over the fate of Ursulus, the treasurer of the empire; and his blood accused the ingratitude of Julian, whose distress had been seasonably relieved by the intrepid liberality of that honest minister. The rage of the soldiers, whom he had provoked by his indiscretion, was the cause and the excuse of his death; and the emperor, deeply wounded by his own reproaches and those of the public, offered some consolation to the family of Ursulus, by the restitution of his confiscated fortunes. Before the end of the year in which they had been adorned with the ensigns of the prefecture and consulship,[2] Taurus and Florentius were reduced to implore the clemency of the inexorable tribunal of Chalcedon. The former was banished to Vercellæ in Italy, and a sentence of death was pronounced against the latter. A wise prince should have rewarded the crime of Taurus: the faithful minister, when he was no longer able to oppose the progress of a rebel, had taken refuge in the court of his benefactor and his lawful sovereign. But the guilt of Florentius justified the severity of the judges; and his escape served to display the magnanimity of Julian; who nobly checked the interested diligence of an informer, and refused to learn what place concealed the wretched fugitive from his just resentment.—*Ammian.* xx. 7. Some months after the tribunal of Chalcedon had been dissolved, the prætorian vicegerent of Africa, the notary Gaudentius, and Artemius [3] duke of Egypt, were executed at Antioch. Artemius had reigned the cruel and corrupt tyrant of a great province; Gaudentius had long practised the arts of calumny against the innocent, the virtuous, and even the person of Julian himself. Yet the circumstances of their trial and condemnation were so unskilfully managed, that these wicked men obtained, in the public opinion, the glory of suffering for the obstinate loyalty with which they had supported the cause of Constantius. The rest of his servants were protected by a general act of oblivion; and they were left to enjoy with impunity the bribes which they had accepted, either to defend the oppressed, or to oppress the friendless. This measure, which, on the soundest principles of policy, may deserve our approbation, was executed in a manner which seemed to degrade the majesty of the throne. Julian was tormented by the importunities of a multitude, particularly of Egyptians, who loudly redemanded the gifts which they had imprudently or illegally bestowed; he foresaw the endless prosecution of vexatious suits; and he engaged a promise, which ought always to have been sacred, that if they would repair to Chalcedon, he would meet them in person, to hear and determine their complaints. But as soon as they were landed, he issued an absolute

[1] Ursuli vero necem ipsa mihi videtur flêsse justitia. Libanius, who imputes his death to the soldiers, attempts to criminate the count of the largesses.

[2] Such respect was still entertained for the venerable names of the commonwealth, that the public was surprised and scandalized to hear Taurus summoned as a criminal under the consulship of Taurus. The summons of his colleague Florentius was probably delayed till the commencement of the ensuing year.

[3] For the guilt and punishment of Artemius, see Julian (Epist. x. p. 379.), and Ammian. (xxii. 6. and Vales. ad loc.). The merit of Artemius, who demolished temples, and was put to death by an apostate, has tempted the Greek and Latin churches to honour him as a martyr. But as ecclesiastical history attests, that he was not only a tyrant, but an Arian, it is not altogether easy to justify this indiscreet promotion. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. vii. 1319.

order, which prohibited the watermen from transporting any Egyptian to Constantinople; and thus detained his disappointed clients on the Asiatic shore, till their patience and money being utterly exhausted, they were obliged to return with indignant murmurs to their native country.[1]

The numerous army of spies, of agents, and informers, enlisted by Constantius to secure the repose of one man, and to interrupt that of millions, was immediately disbanded by his generous successor. Julian was slow in his suspicions, and gentle in his punishments; and his contempt of treason was the result of judgment, of vanity, and of courage. Conscious of superior merit, he was persuaded that few among his subjects would dare to meet him in the field, to attempt his life, or even to seat themselves on his vacant throne. The philosopher could excuse the hasty sallies of discontent; and the hero could despise the ambitious projects, which surpassed the fortune or the abilities of the rash conspirators. A citizen of Ancyra had prepared for his own use a purple garment; and this indiscreet action, which, under the reign of Constantius, would have been considered as a capital offence,[2] was reported to Julian by the officious importunity of a private enemy. The monarch, after making some inquiry into the rank and character of his rival, dispatched the informer with a present of a pair of purple slippers, to complete the magnificence of his Imperial habit. A more dangerous conspiracy was formed by ten of the domestic guards, who had resolved to assassinate Julian in the field of exercise near Antioch. Their intemperance revealed their guilt; and they were conducted in chains to the presence of their injured sovereign, who after a lively representation of the wickedness and folly of their enterprise, instead of a death of torture, which they deserved and expected, pronounced a sentence of exile against the two principal offenders. The only instance in which Julian seemed to depart from his accustomed clemency, was the execution of a rash youth, who with a feeble hand had aspired to seize the reins of empire. But that youth was the son of Marcellus, the general of cavalry, who, in the first campaign of the Gallic war, had deserted the standard of the Cæsar, and the republic. Without appearing to indulge his personal resentment, Julian might easily confound the crime of the son and of the father; but he was reconciled by the distress of Marcellus, and the liberality of the emperor endeavoured to heal the wound which had been inflicted by the hand of justice.[3]

Julian was not insensible of the advantages of freedom.[4] From his studies he had imbibed the spirit of ancient sages and heroes: his

[1] Ammian. xxii. 6. and Vales. ad locum; and the Cod. Theod. l. ii. tit. xxxix. leg. 1.; and Godefroy's Commentary, i. p. 218, ad locum.

[2] The president Montesquieu (Consid. sur la Grand. &c. des Rom. c. xiv. in his works, iii. 448.) excuses this minute and absurd tyranny, by supposing, that actions the most indifferent in our eyes might excite, in a Roman mind, the idea of guilt and danger. This strange apology is supported by a strange misapprehension of the English laws, "chez une nation . . . où "il est defendû de boire à la santé d'une certaine personne."

[3] The clemency of Julian, and the conspiracy formed against his life at Antioch, are described by Ammian. (xxii. 9. and Vales. ad loc.), and Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 99. p. 323.).

[4] According to some, says Aristotle (as he is quoted by Julian ad Themist. p. 261.), the form of absolute government, the παμβασιλεια, is contrary to nature. Both the prince and the philosopher chuse, however, to involve this eternal truth in artful and laboured obscurity.

life and fortunes had depended on the caprice of a tyrant; and when he ascended the throne, his pride was sometimes mortified by the reflection, that the slaves who would not dare to censure his defects, were not worthy to applaud his virtues.[1] He sincerely abhorred the system of Oriental despotism, which Diocletian, Constantine, and the patient habits of fourscore years, had established in the empire. A motive of superstition prevented the execution of the design which Julian had frequently meditated, of relieving his head from the weight of a costly diadem:[2] but he absolutely refused the title of *Dominus*, or *Lord*,[3] a word which was grown so familiar to the ears of the Romans, that they no longer remembered its servile and humiliating origin. The office, or rather the name, of consul, was cherished by a prince who contemplated with reverence the ruins of the republic; and the same behaviour which had been assumed by the prudence of Augustus, was adopted by Julian from choice and inclination. On the calends of January (A.D. 363. Jan. 1.) at break of day, the new consuls, Mamertinus and Nevitta, hastened to the palace to salute the emperor. As soon as he was informed of their approach, he leaped from his throne, eagerly advanced to meet them, and compelled the blushing magistrates to receive the demonstrations of his affected humility. From the palace they proceeded to the senate. The emperor, on foot, marched before their litters; and the gazing multitude admired the image of ancient times, or secretly blamed a conduct, which, in their eyes, degraded the majesty of the purple.[4] But the behaviour of Julian was uniformly supported. During the games of the Circus, he had, imprudently or designedly, performed the manumission of a slave in the presence of the consul. The moment he was reminded that he had trespassed on the jurisdiction of *another* magistrate, he condemned himself to pay a fine of ten pounds of gold; and embraced this public occasion of declaring to the world, that he was subject, like the rest of his fellow-citizens, to the laws,[5] and even to the forms, of the republic. The spirit of his administration, and his regard for the place of his nativity, induced Julian to confer on the senate of Constantinople, the same honours, privileges, and authority, which were still enjoyed by the senate of ancient Rome.—*Zosimus*, l. iii. 158. A legal fiction was introduced, and gradually established, that one half of the national council had migrated into

[1] That sentiment is expressed almost in the words of Julian himself. Ammian. xxii. 10.

[2] Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 95. p. 320.), who mentions the wish and design of Julian, insinuates, in mysterious language (*θεω, ουτο γνοντων . . . αλλ' ην αμεινων ὁ κωλυων*), that the emperor was restrained by some particular revelation.

[3] Julian in Misopogon, p. 343. As he never abolished, by any public law, the proud appellations of *Despot*, or *Dominus*, they are still extant on his medals (Ducange, Fam. Byzantin. p. 38.); and the private displeasure which he affected to express, only gave a different tone to the servility of the court. La Bleterie (Hist. de Jov. ii. 99—102.) has curiously traced the origin and progress of the word *Dominus* under the Imperial government.

[4] Ammian. xxii. 7. The consul Mamertinus (in Paneg. Vet. xi. 28.) celebrates the auspicious day, like an eloquent slave, astonished and intoxicated by the condescension of his master.

[5] Personal satire was condemned by the laws of the twelve tables:

> Si male condiderit in quem quis carmina, jus est,
> Judiciumque. ———

Julian (in Misopogon, p. 337.) owns himself subject to the law; and the Abbé de la Bleterie Hist. de Jovien, ii. 92.) has eagerly embraced a declaration so agreeable to his own system, and indeed to the true spirit of the Imperial constitution.

the East: and the despotic successors of Julian, accepting the title of Senators, acknowledged themselves the members of a respectable body, which was permitted to represent the majesty of the Roman name. From Constantinople, the attention of the monarch was extended to the municipal senates of the provinces. He abolished, by repeated edicts, the unjust and pernicious exemptions, which had withdrawn so many idle citizens from the service of their country; and by imposing an equal distribution of public duties, he restored the strength, the splendour, or, according to the glowing expression of Libanius,[1] the soul of the expiring cities of his empire. The venerable age of Greece excited the most tender compassion in the mind of Julian; which kindled into rapture when he recollected the gods; the heroes; and the men, superior to heroes and to gods; who had bequeathed to the latest posterity the monuments of their genius, or the example of their virtues. He relieved the distress, and restored the beauty, of the cities of Epirus and Peloponnesus.[2] Athens acknowledged him for her benefactor; Argos, for her deliverer. The pride of Corinth, again rising from her ruins with the honours of a Roman colony, exacted a tribute from the adjacent republics for the purpose of defraying the games of the Isthmus, which were celebrated in the amphitheatre with the hunting of bears and panthers. From this tribute the cities of Elis, of Delphi, and of Argos, which had inherited from their remote ancestors the sacred office of perpetuating the Olympic, the Pythian, and the Nemean games, claimed a just exemption. The immunity of Elis and Delphi was respected by the Corinthians; but the poverty of Argos tempted the insolence of oppression; and the feeble complaints of its deputies were silenced by the decree of a provincial magistrate, who seems to have consulted only the interest of the capital, in which he resided. Seven years after this sentence, Julian[3] allowed the cause to be referred to a superior tribunal; and his eloquence was interposed, most probably with success, in the defence of a city, which had been the royal seat of Agamemnon,[4] and had given to Macedonia a race of kings and conquerors.[5]

The laborious administration of military and civil affairs, which were multiplied in proportion to the extent of the empire, exercised the abilities of Julian; but he frequently assumed the two characters

[1] *η της βουλης ισχυς ψυχη πολεως εστιν.* Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 71. p. 296.), Ammian. (xxii. 9.), and the Theod. Code (l. xii. tit. i. leg. 50—55.), Godefroy (iv. 390.) Yet the whole subject of the *Curiæ*, notwithstanding very ample materials, still remains the most obscure in the legal history of the empire.

[2] Quæ paulo ante arida et siti anhelantia visebantur, ea nunc perlui, mundari, madere; Fora, Deambulacra, Gymnasia, lætis et gaudentibus populis frequentari; dies festos, et celebrari veteres, et novos in honorem principis consecrari (Mamertin. xi. 9.). He particularly restored the city of Nicopolis, and the Actiac games, which had been instituted by Augustus.

[3] Julian Epist. xxxv. 407. This epistle, which illustrates the declining age of Greece, is omitted by the Abbé de la Bleterie; and strangely disfigured by the Latin translator, who, by rendering *ατελεια*, *tributum*, and *ιδιωται*, *populus*, directly contradicts the sense of the original.

[4] He reigned in Mycenæ, at the distance of 50 stadia, or 6 miles, from Argos; but those cities which alternately flourished, are confounded by the Greek poets. Strabo, l. viii. 579.

[5] Marsham, Canon. Chron. p. 421. This pedigree from Temenus and Hercules may be suspicious; yet it was allowed, after a strict enquiry by the judges of the Olympic games (Herodot. l. v. c. 22.), at a time when the Macedonian kings were obscure and unpopular in Greece. When the Achæan league declared against Philip, it was thought decent that the deputies of Argos should retire (T. Liv. xxxii. 22.)

of Orator[1] and of Judge,[2] which are almost unknown to the modern sovereigns of Europe. The arts of persuasion, so diligently cultivated by the first Cæsars, were neglected by the military ignorance, and Asiatic pride, of their successors; and if they condescended to harangue the soldiers, whom they feared, they treated with silent disdain the senators, whom they despised. The assemblies of the senate, which Constantius had avoided, were considered by Julian as the place where he could exhibit, with the most propriety, the maxims of a republican, and the talents of a rhetorician. He alternately practised, as in a school of declamation, the several modes of praise, of censure, of exhortation; and his friend Libanius has remarked, that the study of Homer taught him to imitate the simple, concise style of Menelaus, the copiousness of Nestor, whose words descended like the flakes of a winter's snow, or the pathetic and forcible eloquence of Ulysses. The functions of a judge, which are sometimes incompatible with those of a prince, were exercised by Julian, not only as a duty, but as an amusement; and although he might have trusted the integrity and discernment of his Prætorian prefects, he often placed himself by their side on the seat of judgment. The acute penetration of his mind was agreeably occupied in detecting and defeating the chicanery of the advocates, who laboured to disguise the truth of facts, and to pervert the sense of the laws. He sometimes forgot the gravity of his station, asked indiscreet or unseasonable questions, and betrayed, by the loudness of his voice, and the agitation of his body, the earnest vehemence with which he maintained his opinion against the judges, the advocates, and their clients. But his knowledge of his own temper prompted him to encourage, and even to solicit, the reproof of his friends and ministers; and whenever they ventured to oppose the irregular sallies of his passions, the spectators could observe the shame, as well as the gratitude, of their monarch. The decrees of Julian were almost always founded on the principles of justice; and he had the firmness to resist the two most dangerous temptations, which assault the tribunal of a sovereign, under the specious forms of compassion and equity. He decided the merits of the cause without weighing the circumstances of the parties; and the poor, whom he wished to relieve, were condemned to satisfy the just demands of a noble and wealthy adversary. He carefully distinguished the judge from the legislator;[3] and though he meditated a necessary reformation of the Roman jurisprudence, he pronounced sentence according

[1] His eloquence is celebrated by Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 75, 76. p. 300.), who distinctly mentions the orators of Homer. Socrates (l. iii. c. 1) has rashly asserted that Julian was the only prince, since Julius Cæsar, who harangued the senate. All the predecessors of Nero (Tacit. Annal. xiii. 3.), and many of his successors, possessed the faculty of speaking in public; and it might be proved by various examples, that they frequently exercised it in the senate.

[2] Ammian. (xxii. 10.) has impartially stated the merits and defects of his judicial proceedings. Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 90, 91. p. 315.) has seen only the fair side, and his picture, if it flatters the person, expresses at least the duties, of the Judge. Greg. Nazianzen (Orat. iv. p. 120.), who suppresses the virtues, and exaggerates even the venial faults, of the apostate triumphantly asks, Whether such a Judge was fit to be seated between Minos and Rhadamanthus, in the Elysian fields?

[3] Of the laws which Julian enacted in a reign of sixteen months, fifty-four have been admitted into the Codes of Theoditus and Justinian. (Gothofred. Chron. Legum, p. 64—67. The Abbé de la Bleterie (ii. 329.) has chosen one of these laws to give an idea of Julian's Latin style, which is forcible and elaborate, but less pure than his Greek.

to the strict and literal interpretation of those laws, which the magistrates were bound to execute, and the subjects to obey.

The generality of princes, if they were stripped of their purple, and cast naked into the world, would immediately sink to the lowest rank of society, without a hope of emerging from their obscurity. But the personal merit of Julian was, in some measure, independent of his fortune. Whatever had been his choice of life, by the force of intrepid courage, lively wit, and intense application, he would have obtained, or at least he would have deserved, the highest honours of his profession; and Julian might have raised himself to the rank of minister, or general, of the state in which he was born a private citizen. If the jealous caprice of power had disappointed his expectations, if he had prudently declined the paths of greatness, the employment of the same talents in studious solitude, would have placed beyond the reach of kings his present happiness and his immortal fame. When we inspect with minute, or perhaps malevolent, attention the portrait of Julian, something seems wanting to the grace and perfection of the whole figure. His genius was less powerful and sublime than that of Cæsar: nor did he possess the consummate prudence of Augustus. The virtues of Trajan appear more steady and natural, and the philosophy of Marcus is more simple and consistent. Yet Julian sustained adversity with firmness, and prosperity with moderation. After an interval of one hundred and twenty years from the death of Alexander Severus, the Romans beheld an emperor who made no distinction between his duties and his pleasures; who laboured to relieve the distress, and to revive the spirit, of his subjects; and who endeavoured always to connect authority with merit, and happiness with virtue. Even faction, and religious faction, was constrained to acknowledge the superiority of his genius, in peace as well as in war; and to confess, with a sigh, that the apostate Julian was a lover of his country, and that he deserved the empire of the world.[1]

CHAPTER XXIII.

The Religion of Julian.—Universal Toleration.—He attempts to restore and reform the Pagan Worship—to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem.—His artful Persecution of the Christians.—Mutual Zeal and Injustice.

THE character of Apostate has injured the reputation of Julian; and the enthusiasm which clouded his virtues, has exaggerated the real and

[1] . . . . Ductor fortissimus armis;
Conditor et legum celeberrimus; ore manûque
Consultor patriæ; sed non consultor habendæ
Religionis; amans tercentûm millia Divûm.
Perfidus ille Deo, sed non est perfidus orbi.
Prudent. Apotheosis, 450.

The consciousness of a generous sentiment seems to have raised the Christian poet above his usual mediocrity.

apparent magnitude of his faults. Our partial ignorance may represent him as a philosophic monarch, who studied to protect, with an equal hand, the religious factions of the empire; and to allay the theological fever which had inflamed the minds of the people, from the edicts of Diocletian to the exile of Athanasius. A more accurate view of the character and conduct of Julian, will remove this favourable prepossession for a prince who did not escape the general contagion of the times. We enjoy the singular advantage of comparing the pictures which have been delineated by his fondest admirers, and his implacable enemies. The actions of Julian are faithfully related by a judicious and candid historian, the impartial spectator of his life and death. The unanimous evidence of his contemporaries is confirmed by the public and private declarations of the emperor himself; and his various writings express the uniform tenor of his religious sentiments, which policy would have prompted him to dissemble rather that to affect. A devout and sincere attachment for the gods of Athens and Rome, constituted the ruling passion of Julian;[1] the powers of an enlightened understanding were betrayed and corrupted by the influence of superstitious prejudice; and the phantoms which existed only in the mind of the emperor, had a real and pernicious effect on the government of the empire. The vehement zeal of the Christians, who despised the worship, and overturned the altars, of those fabulous deities, engaged their votary in a state of irreconcileable hostility with a very numerous party of his subjects; and he was sometimes tempted, by the desire of victory, or the shame of a repulse, to violate the laws of prudence, and even of justice. The triumph of the party, which he deserted and opposed, has fixed a stain of infamy on the name of Julian; and the unsuccessful apostate has been overwhelmed with a torrent of pious invectives, of which the signal was given by the sonorous trumpet[2] of Gregory Nazianzen.[3] The interesting nature of the events which were crowded into the short reign of this active emperor, deserve a just and circumstantial narrative. His motives, his counsels, and his actions, as far as they are connected with the history of religion, will be the subject of the present chapter.

The cause of his strange and fatal apostacy, may be derived from the early period of his life, when he was left an orphan in the hands of the murderers of his family. The names of Christ and of Constantius, the ideas of slavery and of religion, were soon associated in a youth-

[1] I shall transcribe some of his own expressions from a short religious discourse which the Imperial pontiff composed to censure the bold impiety of a Cynic: Αλλ' ομως ουτω δη τι τους θεους πεφρικα, και φιλω, και σεβω, και αζομαι, και πανθ' απλως τα τοιαυτα πασχω, ὡσπερ αν τις και υια προς αγαθους δεσποτας, προς διδασκαλους, προς πατερας, προς κηδεμονας. Orat. vii. p. 212. The variety and copiousness of the Greek tongue seems inadequate to the fervour of his devotion.

[2] The orator, with some eloquence, much enthusiasm, and more vanity, addresses his discourse to heaven and earth, to men and angels, to the living and the dead; and above all, to the great Constantius (ει τις αισθησις, an odd Pagan expression). He concludes with a bold assurance, that he has erected a monument not less durable, and much more portable, than the columns of Hercules. Greg. Nazianzen, Orat. iii. 50. iv. 134.

[3] See this long invective, which has been injudiciously divided into two orations in Gregory's Works, i. 49—134. Paris, 1630. It was published by Gregory and his friend Basil (iv. 133.), about six months after the death of Julian, when his remains had been carried to Tarsus (iv. 120.); but while Jovian was still on the throne (iii. 54. iv. 117.). I have derived much assistance from a French version and remarks, printed at Lyons 1735.

ful imagination, which was susceptible of the most lively impressions. The care of his infancy was entrusted to Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia,[1] who was related to him on the side of his mother; and till Julian reached the twentieth year of his age, he received from his Christian preceptors, the education not of a hero, but of a saint. The emperor, less jealous of a heavenly than of an earthly crown, contented himself with the imperfect character of a catechumen, while he bestowed the advantages of baptism[2] on the nephews of Constantine.[3] They were even admitted to the inferior offices of the ecclesiastical order; and Julian publicly read the Holy Scriptures in the church of Nicomedia. The study of religion, which they assiduously cultivated, appeared to produce the fairest fruits of faith and devotion.[4] They prayed, they fasted, they distributed alms to the poor, gifts to the clergy, and oblations to the tombs of the martyrs; and the splendid monument of St. Mamas, at Cæsarea, was erected, or at least was undertaken, by the joint labour of Gallus and Julian.[5] They respectfully conversed with the bishops who were eminent for superior sanctity, and solicited the benediction of the monks and hermits, who had introduced into Cappadocia the voluntary hardships of the ascetic life.[6] As the two princes advanced towards the years of manhood, they discovered, in their religious sentiments, the difference of their characters. The dull and obstinate understanding of Gallus embraced, with implicit zeal, the doctrines of Christianity; which never influenced his conduct, or moderated his passions. The mild disposition of the younger brother was less repugnant to the precepts of the Gospel; and his active curiosity might have been gratified by a theological system, which explains the mysterious essence of the Deity, and opens the boundless prospect of invisible and future worlds. But the independent spirit of Julian refused to yield the passive and unresisting obedience which was required, in the name of religion, by the haughty ministers of the church. Their speculative opinions were imposed as positive laws, and guarded by the terrors of eternal punishments; but while they prescribed the rigid formulary of the thoughts, the words, and the actions of the young prince; whilst

[1] Nicomediæ ab Eusebio educatus Episcopo, quem genere longius contingebat. (Ammian. xxii. 9.) Julian never expresses any gratitude towards that Arian prelate; but he celebrates his preceptor, the eunuch Mardonius, and describes his mode of education, which inspired his pupil with a passionate admiration for the genius, and perhaps the religion, of Homer. Misopogon, p. 351.

[2] Greg. Naz. iii. p. 70. He laboured to efface that holy mark in the blood, perhaps, of a Taurobolium. Baron. Annal. Eccles. A.D. 361. No. 3, 4.

[3] Julian himself (Epist. li. 454.) assures the Alexandrians that he had been a Christian (he must mean a sincere one) till the twentieth year of his age.

[4] See his Christian, and even ecclesiastical, education, in Greg. (iii. 38.), Socr. (l. iii. c. i.) and Sozom. (l. v. c. 2.). He escaped very narrowly from being a bishop, and perhaps a saint.

[5] The share of the work which had been allotted to Gallus, was prosecuted with vigour and success; but the earth obstinately rejected and subverted the structures which were imposed by the sacrilegious hand of Julian. Greg. iii. 59. Such a partial earthquake, attested by many living spectators, would form one of the clearest miracles in ecclesiastical story.

[6] The *philosopher* (Fragment, p. 288.) ridicules the iron chains, &c. of these solitary fanatics (Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. ix. 661.), who had forgot that man is by nature a gentle and social animal, *ανθρωπου φυσει πολικικου ζωου και ἡμερου*. The *Pagan* supposes, that because they had renounced the gods, they were possessed and tormented by evil dæmons.

they silenced his objections, and severely checked the freedom of his enquiries, they secretly provoked his impatient genius to disclaim the authority of his ecclesiastical guides. He was educated in the Lesser Asia, amidst the scandals of the Arian controversy.[1] The fierce contests of the Eastern bishops, the incessant alterations of their creeds, and the profane motives which appeared to actuate their conduct, insensibly strengthened the prejudice of Julian, that they neither understood nor believed the religion for which they so fiercely contended. Instead of listening to the proofs of Christianity with that favourable attention which adds weight to the most respectable evidence, he heard with suspicion, and disputed with obstinacy and acuteness, the doctrines for which he already entertained an invincible aversion. Whenever the young princes were directed to compose declamations on the subject of the prevailing controversies, Julian always declared himself the advocate of Paganism; under the specious excuse that, in the defence of the weaker cause, his learning and ingenuity might be more advantageously exercised and displayed.

As soon as Gallus was invested with the honours of the purple, Julian was permitted to breathe the air of freedom, of literature, and of Paganism.[2] The crowd of sophists, who were attracted by the taste and liberality of their royal pupil, had formed a strict alliance between the learning and the religion of Greece; and the poems of Homer, instead of being admired as the original productions of human genius, were seriously ascribed to the heavenly inspiration of Apollo and the muses. The deities of Olympus, as they are painted by the immortal bard, imprint themselves on the minds which are the least addicted to superstitious credulity. Our familiar knowledge of their names and characters, their forms and attributes, *seems* to bestow on those airy beings a real and substantial existence; and the pleasing enchantment produces an imperfect and momentary assent of the imagination to those fables, which are the most repugnant to our reason and experience. In the age of Julian, every circumstance contributed to prolong and fortify the illusion; the magnificent temples of Greece and Asia; the works of those artists who had expressed, in painting or in sculpture, the divine conceptions of the poet; the pomp of festivals and sacrifices; the successful arts of divination; the popular traditions of oracles and prodigies; and the ancient practice of two thousand years. The weakness of polytheism was, in some measure, excused by the moderation of its claims; and the devotion of the Pagans was not incompatible with the most licentious scepticism.[3] Instead of an indivisible and regular system, which occupies the whole extent of the believing mind, the mythology of the Greeks was composed of a thousand loose and flexible parts, and the servant of the gods was at liberty to define the degree and measure of his

[1] Julian apud Cyril. l. vi. 206. l. viii. 253. "You persecute," says he, "those heretics "who do not mourn the dead man precisely in the way which you approve." He shows himself a tolerable theologian; but he maintains that the Christian Trinity is not derived from the doctrine of Paul, of Jesus, or of Moses.

[2] Liban. Orat. Parentalis, c. 9, 10. p. 232, &c. Greg. Naz. Orat. iii. 61. Eunap. Vit. Sophist. in Maximo, p. 68, ed. Commelin.

[3] Hume has ingeniously compared the different operation of theism and polytheism, with regard to the doubt or conviction which they produce in the human mind. Essays, ii. 444. 8vo ed. 1777.

religious faith. The creed which Julian adopted for his own use, was of the largest dimensions; and, by a strange contradiction, he disdained the salutary yoke of the Gospel, whilst he made a voluntary offering of his reason on the altars of Jupiter and Apollo. One of the orations of Julian is consecrated to the honour of Cybele, the mother of the gods, who required from her effeminate priests the bloody sacrifice, so rashly performed by the madness of the Phrygian boy. The pious emperor condescends to relate, without a blush, and without a smile, the voyage of the goddess from the shores of Pergamus to the mouth of the Tyber; and the stupendous miracle, which convinced the senate and people of Rome that the lump of clay, which their ambassadors had transported over the seas, was endowed with life, and sentiment, and divine power.[1] For the truth of this prodigy, he appeals to the public monuments of the city; and censures, with some acrimony, the sickly and affected taste of those men, who impertinently derided the sacred traditions of their ancestors.[2]

But the devout philosopher, who sincerely embraced, and warmly encouraged, the superstition of the people, reserved for himself the privilege of a liberal interpretation; and silently withdrew from the foot of the altars into the sanctuary of the temple. The extravagance of the Grecian mythology proclaimed with a clear and audible voice, that the pious enquirer, instead of being scandalized or satisfied with the literal sense, should diligently explore the occult wisdom, which had been disguised, by the prudence of antiquity, under the mask of folly and of fable.[3] The philosophers of the Platonic school,[4] Plotinus, Porphyry, and the divine Iamblichus, were admired as the most skilful masters of this allegorical science, which laboured to soften and harmonize the deformed features of paganism. Julian himself, who was directed in the mysterious pursuit by Ædesius, the venerable successor of Iamblichus, aspired to the possession of a treasure, which he esteemed, if we may credit his solemn asseverations, far above the empire of the world.[5] It was indeed a treasure, which derived its value only from opinion; and every artist, who flattered himself that he had extracted the precious ore from the surrounding dross, claimed an equal right of stamping the name and figure the most agreeable to his peculiar

[1] The Idæan mother landed in Italy about the end of the second Punic war. The miracle of Claudia, either virgin or matron, who cleared her fame by disgracing the graver modesty of the Roman ladies, is attested by a cloud of witnesses. Their evidence is collected by Drakenborch (ad Silium Italicum, xvii. 33.): but we may observe that Livy (xxix. 14.) slides over the transaction with discreet ambiguity.

[2] I cannot refrain from transcribing the emphatical words of Julian: εμοι δε δοκει ταις πολεσι πιστευειν μαλλον τα τοιαυτα, η' τουτοισι τοις κομψοις ών το ψυχαριον δριμυ μεν, υγεις δε ουδε ἐν βλεπει. Orat. v. 161. Julian likewise declares his firm belief in the *ancilia*, the holy shields, which dropt from heaven on the Quirinal hill; and pities the strange blindness of the Christians, who preferred the *cross* to these celestial trophies. Apud Cyril. l. vi. 194.

[3] See the principles of allegory, in Julian (Orat. vii. p. 216. 222.). His reasoning is less absurd than that of some modern theologians, who assert that an extravagant or contradictory doctrine *must* be divine; since no man alive could have thought of inventing it.

[4] Eunapius has made these sophists the subject of a partial and fanatical history; and the learned Brucker (Hist. Philos. ii. 217.) has employed much labour to illustrate their obscure lives, and incomprehensible doctrines.

[5] Julian, Orat. vii. 222. He swears with the most fervent and enthusiastic devotion; and trembles, lest he should betray too much of these holy mysteries, which the profane might deride with an impious Sardonic laugh.

fancy. The fable of Atys and Cybele had been already explained by Porphyry; but his labours served only to animate the pious industry of Julian, who invented and published his own allegory of that ancient and mystic tale. This freedom of interpretation, which might gratify the pride of the Platonists, exposed the vanity of their art. Without a tedious detail, the modern reader could not form a just idea of the strange allusions, the forced etymologies, the solemn trifling, and the impenetrable obscurity of these sages, who professed to reveal the system of the universe. As the traditions of Pagan mythology were variously related, the sacred interpreters were at liberty to select the most convenient circumstances; and as they translated an arbitrary cypher, they could extract from *any* fable *any* sense which was adapted to their favourite system of religion and philosophy. The lascivious form of a naked Venus was tortured into the discovery of some moral precept, or some physical truth; and the castration of Atys explained the revolution of the sun between the tropics, or the separation of the human soul from vice and error.[1]

The theological system of Julian appears to have contained the sublime and important principles of natural religion. But as the faith, which is not founded on revelation, must remain destitute of any firm assurance, the disciple of Plato imprudently relapsed into the habits of vulgar superstition; and the popular and philosophic notion of the Deity seems to have been confounded in the practice, the writings, and even in the mind of Julian.[2] The pious emperor acknowledged and adored the Eternal Cause of the universe, to whom he ascribed all the perfections of an infinite nature, invisible to the eyes, and inaccessible to the understanding, of feeble mortals. The Supreme God had created, or rather, in the Platonic language, had generated, the gradual succession of dependent spirits, of gods, of dæmons, of heroes, and of men; and every being which derived its existence immediately from the First Cause, received the inherent gift of immortality. That so precious an advantage might not be lavished upon unworthy objects, the Creator had entrusted to the skill and power of the inferior gods, the office of forming the human body, and of arranging the beautiful harmony of the animal, the vegetable, and the mineral kingdoms. To the conduct of these divine ministers he delegated the temporal government of this lower world; but their imperfect administration is not exempt from discord or error. The earth and its inhabitants are divided among them, and the characters of Mars or Minerva, of Mercury or Venus, may be distinctly traced in the laws and manners of their peculiar votaries. As long as our immortal souls are confined in a mortal prison, it is our interest, as well as our duty, to solicit the favour, and to deprecate the wrath, of the powers of heaven; whose pride is gratified by the devotion of mankind; and whose grosser parts may be supposed to derive some nourishment

[1] See the fifth oration of Julian. But all the allegories which ever issued from the Platonic school, are not worth the short poem of Catullus on the same extraordinary subject.

[2] The true religion of Julian may be deduced from the Cæsars, 308. with Spanheim's notes and illustrations, from the fragments in Cyril, l. ii. 57. and especially from the theological oration in Solem Regem, p. 130. addressed, in the confidence of friendship, to the præfect Sallust.

from the fumes of sacrifice.[1] The inferior gods might sometimes condescend to animate the statues, and to inhabit the temples, which were dedicated to their honour. They might occasionally visit the earth, but the heavens were the proper throne and symbol of their glory. The invariable order of the sun, moon, and stars, was hastily admitted by Julian, as a proof of their *eternal* duration; and their eternity was a sufficient evidence that they were the workmanship, not of an inferior deity, but of the Omnipotent King. In the system of the Platonists, the visible, was a type of the invisible, world. The celestial bodies, as they were informed by a divine spirit, might be considered as the objects the most worthy of religious worship. The SUN, whose genial influence pervades and sustains the universe, justly claimed the adoration of mankind, as the bright representative of the LOGOS, the lively, the rational, the beneficent image of the intellectual Father.[2]

In every age, the absence of genuine inspiration is supplied by the strong illusions of enthusiasm, and the mimic arts of imposture. If, in the time of Julian, these arts had been practised only by the pagan priests, for the support of an expiring cause, some indulgence might perhaps be allowed to the interest and habits of the sacerdotal character. But it may appear a subject of surprise and scandal, that the philosophers themselves should have contributed to abuse the superstitious credulity of mankind,[3] and that the Grecian mysteries should have been supported by the magic or theurgy of the modern Platonists. They arrogantly pretended to control the order of nature, to explore the secrets of futurity, to command the service of the inferior dæmons, to enjoy the view and conversation of the superior gods, and, by disengaging the soul from her material bands, to reunite that immortal particle with the Infinite and Divine Spirit.

The devout and fearless curiosity of Julian tempted the philosophers with the hopes of an easy conquest; which, from the situation of their young proselyte, might be productive of the most important consequences.[4] Julian imbibed the first rudiments of the Platonic doctrines from the mouth of Ædesius, who had fixed at Pergamus his wandering and persecuted school. But as the declining strength of that venerable sage was unequal to the ardour, the diligence, the rapid conception of his pupil, two of his most learned disciples, Chrysanthes and Eusebius, supplied, at his own desire, the place of their aged master. These

[1] Julian adopts this gross conception, by ascribing it to his favourite Marcus Antoninus (Cæsares, p. 335.). The Stoics and Platonists hesitated between the analogy of bodies and the purity of spirits; yet the gravest philosophers inclined to the whimsical fancy of Aristophanes and Lucian, that an unbelieving age might starve the immortal gods. Observ. de Spanh. p. 284. 444, &c.

[2] Ηλιον λεγω, το ζων αγαλμα και εμψυχον, και εννουν, και αγαθοεργον του νοητου πατρος. Julian, epist. xli. In another place (ap. Cyril. l. ii. 69.), he calls the Sun, God, and the throne of God. Julian believed the Platonician Trinity; and only blames the Christians for preferring a mortal, to an immortal, *Logos*.

[3] The sophists of Eunapius perform as many miracles as the saints of the desert; and the only circumstance in their favour is, that they are of a less gloomy complexion. Instead of devils with horns and tails, Iamblichus evoked the genii of love, Eros and Anteros, from two adjacent fountains. Two beautiful boys issued from the water, fondly embraced him as their father, and retired at his command. P. 26.

[4] The dexterous management of these sophists, who played their credulous pupil into each other's hands, is fairly told by Eunapius (p. 69.), with unsuspecting simplicity. La Bleterie understands, and neatly describes, the whole comedy (Vie de Julien, p. 61.).

philosophers seem to have prepared and distributed their respective parts ; and they artfully contrived, by dark hints, and affected disputes, to excite the impatient hopes of the *aspirant*, till they delivered him into the hands of their associate Maximus, the boldest and most skilful master of the Theurgic science. By his hands, Julian was secretly initiated at Ephesus, in the twentieth year of his age. His residence at Athens confirmed this unnatural alliance of philosophy and superstition. He obtained the privilege of a solemn initiation into the mysteries of Eleusis, which, amidst the general decay of the Grecian worship, still retained some vestiges of their primæval sanctity; and such was the zeal of Julian, that he afterwards invited the Eleusinian pontiff to the court of Gaul, for the sole purpose of consummating, by mystic rites and sacrifices, the great work of his sanctification. As these ceremonies were performed in the depth of caverns, and in the silence of the night; and as the inviolable secret of the mysteries was preserved by the discretion of the initated, I shall not presume to describe the horrid sounds, and fiery apparitions, which were presented to the senses, or the imagination, of the credulous aspirant,[1] till the visions of comfort and knowledge broke upon him in a blaze of celestial light.[2] In the caverns of Ephesus and Eleusis, the mind of Julian was penetrated with sincere, deep, and unalterable enthusiasm ; though he might sometimes exhibit the vicissitudes of pious fraud and hypocrisy, which may be observed, or at least suspected, in the characters of the most conscientious fanatics. From that moment he consecrated his life to the service of the gods ; and while the occupations of war, of government, and of study, seemed to claim the whole measure of his time, a stated portion of the hours of the night was invariably reserved for the exercise of private devotion. The temperance which adorned the severe manners of the soldier and the philosopher, was connected with some strict and frivolous rules of religious abstinence ; and it was in honour of Pan or Mercury, of Hecate or Isis, that Julian, on particular days, denied himself the use of some particular food, which might have been offensive to his tutelar deities. By these voluntary fasts, he prepared his senses and his understanding for the frequent and familiar visits with which he was honoured by the celestial powers. Notwithstanding the modest silence of Julian himself, we may learn from his faithful friend, the orator Libanius, that he lived in a perpetual intercourse with the gods and goddesses ; that they descended upon earth, to enjoy the conversation of their favourite hero ; that they gently interrupted his slumbers, by touching his hand or his hair ; that they warned him of every impending danger, and conducted him, by their infallible wisdom, in every action of his life ; and that he had acquired such an intimate knowledge of his heavenly guests, as readily to distinguish the voice of Jupiter from that of Minerva, and the form of Apollo from the figure

[1] When Julian, in a momentary panic, made the sign of the cross, the dæmons instantly disappeared (Greg. Naz. Orat. iii. 71.). Gregory supposes that they were frightened, but the priests declared that they were indignant. The reader, according to the measure of his faith, will determine this profound question.

[2] A dark and distant view of the terrors and joys of initiation is shown by Dion, Chrysostom, Themistius, Proclus, and Stobæus. The learned author of the Divine Legation has exhibited their words (i. 239. 247, 280.), which he dexterously or forcibly applies to his own hypothesis.

of Hercules.[1] These sleeping or waking visions, the ordinary effects of abstinence and fanaticism, would almost degrade the emperor to the level of an Egyptian monk. But the useless lives of Antony or Pachomius were consumed in these vain occupations. Julian could break from the dream of superstition to arm himself for battle; and after vanquishing in the field the enemies of Rome, he calmly retired into his tent, to dictate the wise and salutary laws of an empire, or to indulge his genius in the elegant pursuits of literature and philosophy.

The important secret of the apostacy of Julian was entrusted to the fidelity of the *initiated*, with whom he was united by the sacred ties of friendship and religion.[2] The pleasing rumour was cautiously circulated among the adherents of the ancient worship; and his future greatness became the object of the hopes, the prayers, and the predictions of the pagans, in every province of the empire. From the zeal and virtues of their royal proselyte, they fondly expected the cure of every evil, and the restoration of every blessing; and instead of disapproving of the ardour of their pious wishes, Julian ingenuously confessed, that he was ambitious to attain a situation, in which he might be useful to his country, and to his religion. But this religion was viewed with an hostile eye by the successor of Constantine, whose capricious passions alternately saved and threatened the life of Julian. The arts of magic and divination were strictly prohibited under a despotic government, which condescended to fear them; and if the pagans were reluctantly indulged in the exercise of their superstition, the rank of Julian would have excepted him from the general toleration. The apostate soon became the presumptive heir of the monarchy, and his death could alone have appeased the just apprehensions of the Christians.[3] But the young prince, who aspired to the glory of a hero rather than of a martyr, consulted his safety by dissembling his religion; and the easy temper of polytheism permitted him to join in the public worship of a sect which he inwardly despised. Libanius has considered the hypocrisy of his friend as a subject, not of censure, but of praise. "As the statues of the gods," says that orator, "which "have been defiled with filth, are again placed in a magnificent temple; "so the beauty of truth was seated in the mind of Julian, after it had "been purified from the errors and follies of his education. His "sentiments were changed; but as it would have been dangerous to "have avowed his sentiments, his conduct still continued the same. "Very different from the ass in Æsop, who disguised himself with a "lion's hide, our lion was obliged to conceal himself under the skin of "an ass; and, while he embraced the dictates of reason, to obey the "laws of prudence and necessity."—*Liban. Orat. Parent.* c. ix. 233. The dissimulation of Julian lasted above ten years, from his secret

[1] Julian's modesty confined him to obscure and occasional hints; but Libanius expatiates with pleasure on the fasts and visions of the religious hero (Legat. ad Julian. p. 157. and Orat. Parent. c. lxxxiii. 309.).

[2] Liban. Orat. Parent. c. x. p. 233, 234. Gallus had some reason to suspect the secret apostacy of his brother; and in a letter, which may be received as genuine, he exhorts Julian to adhere to the religion of their *ancestors*; an argument, which, as it should seem, was not yet perfectly ripe. Julian. Op. p. 454. and Hist. de Jovien, ii. 141.

[3] Greg. (iii. 50.), with inhuman zeal, censures Constantius for sparing the infant apostate (κακως σαθεντα). His French translator (p. 265.) cautiously observes, that such expressions must not be prises à la lettre

initiation at Ephesus, to the beginning of the civil war; when he declared himself at once the implacable enemy of Christ and of Constantius. This state of constraint might contribute to strengthen his devotion; and as soon as he had satisfied the obligation of assisting, on solemn festivals, at the assemblies of the Christians, Julian returned, with the impatience of a lover, to burn his free and voluntary incense on the domestic chapels of Jupiter and Mercury. But as every act of dissimulation must be painful to an ingenuous spirit, the profession of Christianity increased the aversion of Julian for a religion, which oppressed the freedom of his mind, and compelled him to hold a conduct repugnant to the noblest attributes of human nature, sincerity and courage.

The inclination of Julian might prefer the gods of Homer, and of the Scipios, to the new faith, which his uncle had established in the Roman empire; and in which he himself had been sanctified by the sacrament of baptism. But as a philosopher, it was incumbent on him to justify his dissent from Christianity, which was supported by the number of its converts, by the chain of prophecy, the splendour of miracles, and the weight of evidence. The elaborate work,[1] which he composed amidst the preparations of the Persian war, contained the substance of those arguments which he had long revolved in his mind. Some fragments have been transcribed and preserved, by his adversary, the vehement Cyril of Alexandria;[2] and they exhibit a very singular mixture of wit and learning, of sophistry and fanaticism. The elegance of the style, and the rank of the author, recommended his writings to the public attention:[3] and in the impious list of the enemies of Christianity, the celebrated name of Porphyry was effaced by the superior merit or reputation of Julian. The minds of the faithful were either seduced or scandalized, or alarmed; and the pagans, who sometimes presumed to engage in the unequal dispute, derived, from the popular work of their Imperial missionary, an inexhaustible supply of fallacious objections. But in the assiduous prosecution of these theological studies, the emperor of the Romans imbibed the illiberal prejudices and passions of a polemic divine. He contracted an irrevocable obligation to maintain and propagate his religious opinions; and whilst he secretly applauded the strength and dexterity with which he wielded the weapons of controversy, he was tempted to distrust the sincerity, or to despise the understandings, of his antagonists, who could obstinately resist the force of reason and eloquence.

The Christians, who beheld with horror and indignation the apostacy of Julian, had much more to fear from his power than from his arguments. The pagans, who were conscious of his fervent zeal,

[1] Fabricius (Biblio. Græc. l. v. c. viii. 88.) and Lardner (Heath. Test. iv. 44.) have accurately compiled all that can now be discovered of Julian's work against the Christians.

[2] About seventy years after the death of Julian, he executed a task which had been feebly attempted by Philip of Side, a prolix and contemptible writer. Even the work of Cyril has not entirely satisfied the most favourable judges: and La Bleterie (Pref. a l'Hist. de Jovien, p. 30.) wishes that some *theologien philosophe* would undertake the refutation of Julian.

[3] Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. lxxxvii. 313.), who has been suspected of assisting his friend, prefers this divine vindication (Orat. ix. in necem Julian, p. 255.) to the writings of Porphyry. His judgment may be arraigned (Socr. l. iii. c. 23.), but Libanius cannot be accused of flattery to a dead prince.

expected, perhaps with impatience, that the flames of persecution should be immediately kindled against the enemies of the gods: and that the ingenious malice of Julian would invent some cruel refinements of death and torture, which had been unknown to the rude and inexperienced fury of his predecessors. But the hopes, as well as the fears, of the religious factions were apparently disappointed, by the prudent humanity of a prince,[1] who was careful of his own fame, of the public peace, and of the rights of mankind. Instructed by history and reflection, Julian was persuaded, that if the diseases of the body may sometimes be cured by salutary violence, neither steel nor fire can eradicate the erroneous opinions of the mind. The reluctant victim may be dragged to the foot of the altar; but the heart still abhors and disclaims the sacrilegious act of the hand. Religious obstinacy is hardened and exasperated by oppression; and, as soon as the persecution subsides, those who have yielded, are restored as penitents, and those who have resisted, are honoured as saints and martyrs. If Julian adopted the unsuccessful cruelty of Diocletian and his colleagues, he was sensible that he should stain his memory with the name of tyrant, and add new glories to the Catholic church, which had derived strength and increase from the severity of the pagan magistrates. Actuated by these motives, and apprehensive of disturbing the repose of an unsettled reign, Julian surprised the world by an edict, which was not unworthy of a statesman, or a philosopher. He extended to all the inhabitants of the Roman world, the benefits of a free and equal toleration; and the only hardship which he inflicted on the Christians, was to deprive them of the power of tormenting their fellow-subjects, whom they stigmatized with the odious titles of idolaters and heretics. The Pagans received a gracious permission, or rather an express order, to open ALL their temples;[2] and they were at once delivered from the oppressive laws, and arbitrary vexations, which they had sustained under the reign of Constantine and of his sons. At the same time, the bishops and clergy, who had been banished by the Arian monarch, were recalled from exile, and restored to their respective churches; the Donatists, the Novatians, the Macedonians, the Eunomians, and those who, with a more prosperous fortune, adhered to the doctrine of the council of Nice. Julian, who understood and derided their theological disputes, invited to the palace the leaders of the hostile sects, that he might enjoy the agreeable spectacle of their furious encounters. The clamour of controversy sometimes provoked the emperor to exclaim, "Hear me! the Franks "have heard me, and the Alemanni;" but he soon discovered that he was now engaged with more obstinate and implacable enemies; and though he exerted the powers of oratory to persuade them to live in concord, or at least in peace, he was perfectly satisfied, before he dis-

[1] Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. lviii. 283.) has eloquently explained the tolerating principles and conduct of his Imperial friend. In a very remarkable epistle to the people of Bostra, Julian himself (epist. lii.) professes his moderation, and betrays his zeal; which is acknowledged by Ammianus, and exposed by Gregory (Orat. iii. 72.).

[2] In Greece the temples of Minerva were opened by his express command, before the death of Constantius (Liban. Orat. Parent. c. 55. p. 280.); and Julian declares himself a pagan in his public manifesto to the Athenians. This unquestionable evidence may correct the hasty assertion of Ammianus, who seems to suppose Constantinople to be the place where he discovered his attachment to the gods.

missed them from his presence, that he had nothing to dread from the union of the Christians. The impartial Ammianus has ascribed this affected clemency to the desire of fomenting the intestine divisions of the church; and the insidious design of undermining the foundations of Christianity, was inseparably connected with the zeal, which Julian professed, to restore the ancient religion of the empire.[1]

As soon as he ascended the throne, he assumed, according to the custom of his predecessors, the character of supreme pontiff; not only as the most honourable title of Imperial greatness, but as a sacred and important office; the duties of which he was resolved to execute with pious diligence. As the business of the state prevented the emperor from joining every day in the public devotion of his subjects, he dedicated a domestic chapel to his tutelar deity the Sun; his gardens were filled with statues and altars of the gods; and each apartment of the palace displayed the appearance of a magnificent temple. Every morning he saluted the parent of light with a sacrifice; the blood of another victim was shed at the moment when the Sun sunk below the horizon; and the Moon, the Stars, and the Genii of the night received their respective and seasonable honours from the indefatigable devotion of Julian. On solemn festivals, he regularly visited the temple of the god or goddess to whom the day was peculiarly consecrated, and endeavoured to excite the religion of the magistrates and people by the example of his own zeal. Instead of maintaining the lofty state of a monarch, distinguished by the splendour of his purple, and encompassed by the golden shields of his guards, Julian solicited, with respectful eagerness, the meanest offices which contributed to the worship of the gods. Amidst the sacred but licentious crowd of priests, of inferior ministers, and of female dancers, who were dedicated to the service of the temple, it was the business of the emperor to bring the wood, to blow the fire, to handle the knife, to slaughter the victim, and thrusting his bloody hands into the bowels of the expiring animal, to draw forth the heart or liver, and to read, with the consummate skill of an haruspex, the imaginary signs of future events. The wisest of the pagans censured this extravagant superstition, which affected to despise the restraints of prudence and decency. Under the reign of a prince, who practised the rigid maxims of economy, the expence of religious worship consumed a very large portion of the revenue; a constant supply of the scarcest and most beautiful birds was transported from distant climates, to bleed on the altars of the gods; an hundred oxen were frequently sacrificed by Julian on one and the same day; and it soon became a popular jest, that if he should return with conquest from the Persian war, the breed of horned cattle must infallibly be extinguished. Yet this expence may appear inconsiderable, when it is compared with the splendid presents which were offered, either by the hand, or by order, of the emperor, to all the celebrated places of devotion in the Roman world; and with the sums allotted to repair and decorate the ancient temples, which had suffered the silent

[1] Ammian. xxii. 5. Soz. l. v. c. 5. Bestia moritur, tranquillitas redit . . . . omnes episcopi qui de propriis fedibus fuerant exterminati per indulgentiam novi principis ad ecclesias redeunt. Jerom. adversus Luciferianos, ii. 143. Optatus accuses the Donatists for owing their safety to an apostate (l. ii. c. 16. p. 36.).

decay of time, or the recent injuries of Christian rapine. Encouraged by the example, the exhortations, the liberality, of their pious sovereign, the cities and families resumed the practice of their neglected ceremonies. "Every part of the world," exclaims Libanius, with devout transport, "displayed the triumph of religion; and the grateful prospect of flaming altars, bleeding victims, the smoke of incense, and a solemn train of priests and prophets, without fear and without danger. The sound of prayer and of music was heard on the tops of the highest mountains; and the same ox afforded a sacrifice for the gods, and a supper for their joyous votaries."[1]

But the genius and power of Julian were unequal to the enterprise of restoring a religion, which was destitute of theological principles, of moral precepts, and of ecclesiastical discipline; which rapidly hastened to decay and dissolution, and was not susceptible of any solid or consistent reformation. The jurisdiction of the supreme pontiff, more especially after that office had been united with the Imperial dignity, comprehended the whole extent of the Roman empire. Julian named for his vicars, in the several provinces, the priests and philosophers, whom he esteemed the best qualified to co-operate in the execution of his great design; and his pastoral letters,[2] if we may use that name, still represent a very curious sketch of his wishes and intentions. He directs, that in every city the sacerdotal order should be composed, without any distinction of birth or fortune, of those persons who were the most conspicuous for their love of the gods, and of men. "If they are guilty," continues he, "of any scandalous offence, they should be censured or degraded by the superior pontiff; but, as long as they retain their rank, they are entitled to the respect of the magistrates and people. Their humility may be shown in the plainness of their domestic garb; their dignity, in the pomp of holy vestments. When they are summoned in their turn to officiate before the altar, they ought not, during the appointed number of days, to depart from the precincts of the temple; nor should a single day be suffered to elapse, without the prayers and the sacrifice, which they are obliged to offer for the prosperity of the state, and of individuals. The exercise of their sacred functions requires an immaculate purity, both of mind and body; and even when they are dismissed from the temple to the occupations of common life, it is incumbent on them to excel in decency and virtue the rest of their fellow-citizens. The priest of the gods should never be seen in theatres or taverns. His conversation should be chaste, his diet temperate, his friends of honourable reputation; and, if he sometimes visits the Forum or the Palace, he should appear only as the advocate of those who have vainly solicited either justice or mercy. His studies should be suited

[1] The restoration of the Pagan worship is described by Julian (Misopog. p. 346.), Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 60. p. 286. and Orat. Consular. ad Julian, p. 245. ed. Morel.), Ammian. (xxii. 12.), and Greg. Naz. (Orat. iv. 121.). These writers agree in the essential, and even minute, facts: but the different lights in which they view the extreme devotion of Julian, are expressive of the gradations of self-applause, passionate admiration, mild reproof, and partial invective.

[2] Julian Epistol. xlix. lxii, lxiii. and a long and curious fragment, without beginning or end (p. 288.). The supreme pontiff derides the Mosaic history, and the Christian discipline, prefers the Greek poets to the Hebrew prophets, and palliates, with the skill of a Jesuit, the *relative* worship of images.

"to the sanctity of his profession. Licentious tales, or comedies, or "satires, must be banished from his library; which ought solely to "consist of historical and philosophical writings; of history which is "founded in truth, and of philosophy which is connected with religion. "The impious opinions of the Epicureans and Sceptics deserve his "abhorrence and contempt;[1] but he should diligently study the systems "of Pythagoras, of Plato, and of the Stoics, which unanimously teach "that there *are* gods; that the world is governed by their providence; "that their goodness is the source of every temporal blessing; and "that they have prepared for the human soul a future state of reward "or punishment." The Imperial pontiff inculcates, in the most persuasive language, the duties of benevolence and hospitality; exhorts his inferior clergy to recommend the universal practice of those virtues; promises to assist their indigence from the public treasury; and declares his resolution of establishing hospitals in every city, where the poor should be received without any invidious distinction of country or of religion. Julian beheld with envy the wise and humane regulations of the church; and he very frankly confesses his intention to deprive the Christians of the applause, as well as advantage, which they had acquired by the exclusive practice of charity and beneficence.[2] The same spirit of imitation might dispose the emperor to adopt several ecclesiastical institutions, the use and importance of which were approved by the success of his enemies. But if these imaginary plans of reformation had been realized, the forced and imperfect copy would have been less beneficial to Paganism, than honourable to Christianity.[3] The Gentiles, who peaceably followed the customs of their ancestors, were rather surprised than pleased with the introduction of foreign manners; and, in the short period of his reign, Julian had frequent occasions to complain of the want of fervour of his own party.[4]

The enthusiasm of Julian prompted him to embrace the friends of Jupiter as his personal friends and brethren; and though he partially overlooked the merit of Christian constancy, he admired and rewarded the noble perseverance of those Gentiles who had preferred the favour of the gods to that of the emperor.[5] If they cultivated the literature, as well as the religion, of the Greeks, they acquired an additional claim to the friendship of Julian, who ranked the Muses in the number of his tutelar deities. In the religion which he had adopted,

[1] The exultation of Julian (p. 301.), that these impious sects, and even their writings, are extinguished, may be consistent enough: but it is unworthy of a philosopher to wish that any opinions and arguments the most repugnant to his own should be concealed from the knowledge of mankind.

[2] Yet he insinuates, that the Christians, under the pretence of charity, inveigled children from their religion and parents, conveyed them on shipboard, and devoted those victims to a life of poverty or servitude in a remote country (p. 305.). Had the charge been proved, it was his duty, not to complain, but to punish.

[3] Greg. Naz. is facetious, ingenious, and argumentative (Orat. iii. 101, &c.). He ridicules the folly of such vain imitation; and amuses himself with inquiring, what lessons, moral or theological, could be extracted from the Grecian fables.

[4] He accuses one of his pontiffs of a secret confederacy with the Christian bishops and presbyters (Epist. lxii.). *Ορων ουν πολλην μεν ολιγωριαν ουσων ημιν προς τους θεους*; and again, *ημας δε ουτω ραθυμως*, &c. Epist. lxiii.

[5] He praises the fidelity of Callixene, priestess of Ceres, who had been twice as constant as Penelope, and rewards her with the priesthood of the Phrygian goddess at Pessinus (Julian. Epist. xxi.). He applauds the firmness of Sopater of Hierapolis, who had been repeatedly pressed by Constantius and Gallus to *apostatize* (Epist. xxvii. 401.).

piety and learning were almost synonymous;[1] and a crowd of poets, of rhetoricians, and of philosophers, hastened to the Imperial court, to occupy the vacant places of the bishops, who had seduced the credulity of Constantius. His successor esteemed the ties of common initiation as far more sacred than those of consanguinity: he chose his favourites among the sages, who were deeply skilled in the occult sciences of magic and divination; and every impostor, who pretended to reveal the secrets of futurity, was assured of enjoying the present hour in honour and affluence.[2] Among the philosophers, Maximus obtained the most eminent rank in the friendship of his royal disciple, who communicated, with unreserved confidence, his actions, his sentiments, and his religious designs, during the anxious suspense of the civil war.[3] As soon as Julian had taken possession of the palace of Constantinople, he dispatched an honourable and pressing invitation to Maximus; who then resided at Sardes in Lydia, with Chrysanthius, the associate of his art and studies. The prudent and superstitious Chrysanthius refused to undertake a journey which showed itself, according to the rules of divination, with the most threatening and malignant aspect: but his companion, whose fanaticism was of a bolder cast, persisted in his interrogations, till he had extorted from the gods a seeming consent to his own wishes, and those of the emperor. The journey of Maximus through the cities of Asia, displayed the triumph of philosophic vanity; and the magistrates vied with each other in the honourable reception which they prepared for the friend of their sovereign. Julian was pronouncing an oration before the senate, when he was informed of the arrival of Maximus. The emperor immediately interrupted his discourse, advanced to meet him, and, after a tender embrace, conducted him by the hand into the midst of the assembly: where he publicly acknowledged the benefits which he had derived from the instructions of the philosopher. Maximus,[4] who soon acquired the confidence, and influenced the councils, of Julian, was insensibly corrupted by the temptations of a court. His dress became more splendid, his demeanour more lofty, and he was exposed, under a succeeding reign, to a disgraceful inquiry into the means by which the disciple of Plato had accumulated, in the short duration of his favour, a very scandalous proportion of wealth. Of the other philosophers and sophists, who were invited to the Imperial residence by the choice of Julian, or by the success of Maximus, few were able to preserve their innocence, or their reputation.[5] The liberal gifts of money, lands, and houses, were insufficient to satiate their rapacious avarice; and the

[1] Ο δε νομιζων αδελφα λογους τε και θεων ιερα. Orat. Parent. c. 77. p. 302. The same sentiment is frequently inculcated by Julian, Libanius, and the rest of their party.

[2] The curiosity and credulity of the emperor, who tried every mode of divination, are fairly exposed by Ammianus, xxii. 12.

[3] Julian. Epist. 38. Three other epistles (15. 16. 39.) in the same style of friendship and confidence, are addressed to the philosopher Maximus.

[4] Eunapius (in Maximo, p. 77, and in Chrysanthio, p. 147.) has minutely related these anecdotes, which he conceives to be the most important events of the age. Yet he fairly confesses the frailty of Maximus. His reception at Constantinople is described by Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 85. p. 301.) and Ammian. (xxii. 7.).

[5] Chrysanthius, who had refused to quit Lydia, was created high-priest of the province. His cautious and temperate use of power secured him after the revolution; and he lived in peace; while Maximus, Priscus, &c. were persecuted by the Christian ministers. See the adventures of those fanatic sophists, collected by Brucker, ii. 281—293.

indignation of the people was justly excited by the remembrance of their abject poverty and disinterested professions. The penetration of Julian could not always be deceived: but he was unwilling to despise the characters of those men whose talents deserved his esteem; he desired to escape the double reproach of imprudence and inconstancy; and he was apprehensive of degrading, in the eyes of the profane, the honour of letters and of religion.[1]

The favour of Julian was almost equally divided between the Pagans, who had firmly adhered to the worship of their ancestors, and the Christians, who prudently embraced the religion of their sovereign. The acquisition of new proselytes[2] gratified the ruling passions of his soul, superstition and vanity; and he was heard to declare, with the enthusiasm of a missionary, that if he could render each individual richer than Midas, and every city greater than Babylon, he should not esteem himself the benefactor of mankind, unless, at the same time, he could reclaim his subjects from their impious revolt against the immortal gods.[3] A prince, who had studied human nature, and who possessed the treasures of the Roman empire, could adapt his arguments, his promises, and his rewards, to every order of Christians;[4] and the merit of a seasonable conversion was allowed to supply the defects of a candidate, or even to expiate the guilt of a criminal. As the army is the most forcible engine of absolute power, Julian applied himself, with peculiar diligence, to corrupt the religion of his troops, without whose hearty concurrence every measure must be dangerous and unsuccessful; and the natural temper of soldiers made this conquest as easy as it was important The legions of Gaul devoted themselves to the faith, as well as to the fortunes, of their victorious leader; and even before the death of Constantius, he had the satisfaction of announcing to his friends, that they assisted with fervent devotion, and voracious appetite, at the sacrifices, which were repeatedly offered in his camp, of whole hecatombs of fat oxen.[5] The armies of the East, which had been trained under the standard of the cross, and of Constantius, required a more artful and expensive mode of persuasion. On the days of solemn and public festivals, the emperor received the homage, and rewarded the merit, of the troops. His throne of state was encircled with the military ensigns of Rome and the republic;

[1] Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 101, 102. p. 324.) and Eunap. (Vit. Sophist. in Proæresio, p. 126.). Some students, whose expectations perhaps were groundless, or extravagant, retired in disgust Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 120.). It is strange that we should not be able to contradict the title of one of Tillemont's chapters (Hist. des Emp. iv. 960.), "La Cour de Julien est pleine de "philosophes et de gens perdûs."

[2] Under the reign of Lewis XIV. his subjects of every rank aspired to the glorious title of *Convertisseur*, expressive of their zeal and success in making proselytes. The word and the idea are growing obsolete in France; may they never be introduced into England!

[3] See the strong expressions of Libanius, which were probably those of Julian himself (Orat. Parent. c. 59. p. 285.).

[4] When Greg. Naz. (Orat. x. p. 167.) is desirous to magnify the Christian firmness of his brother Cæsarius, physician to the Imperial court, he owns that Cæsarius disputed with a formidable adversary, *πολυν εν οπλοις, και μηγαν εν λογων δεινοτητι.* In his invectives he scarcely allows any share of wit or courage to the apostate.

[5] Julian. Epist. xxxviii. Ammian. xxii. 12. Adeo ut in dies pæne singulos milites carnis distentiore sagina victitantes incultius, potusque aviditate correpti, humeris impositi transeuntium per plateas, ex publicis ædibus . . . . ad sua diversoria portarentur. The devout prince and the indignant historian describe the same scene; and in Illyricum or Antioch, similar causes must have produced similar effects.

the holy name of Christ was erazed from the *Labarum;* and the symbols of war, of majesty, and of pagan superstition, were so dexterously blended, that the faithful subject incurred the guilt of idolatry, when he respectfully saluted the person or image of his sovereign. The soldiers passed successively in review; and each of them, before he received from the hand of Julian a liberal donative, proportioned to his rank and services, was required to cast a few grains of incense into the flame which burnt upon the altar. Some Christian confessors might resist, and others might repent; but the far greater number, allured by the prospect of gold, and awed by the presence of the emperor, contracted the criminal engagement; and their future perseverance in the worship of the gods was enforced by every consideration of duty and of interest. By the frequent repetition of these arts, and at the expence of sums which would have purchased the service of half the nations of Scythia, Julian gradually acquired for his troops the imaginary protection of the gods, and for himself the firm and effectual support of the Roman legions.[1] It is indeed more than probable, that the restoration and encouragement of Paganism revealed a multitude of pretended Christians, who, from motives of temporal advantage, had acquiesced in the religion of the former reign; and who afterwards returned, with the same flexibility of conscience, to the faith which was professed by the successors of Julian.

While the devout monarch incessantly laboured to restore and propagate the religion of his ancestors, he embraced the extraordinary design of rebuilding the temple of Jerusalem. In a public epistle[2] to the nation or community of the Jews, dispersed through the provinces, he pities their misfortunes, condemns their oppressors, praises their constancy, declares himself their gracious protector, and expresses a pious hope, that after his return from the Persian war, he may be permitted to pay his grateful vows to the Almighty in his holy city of Jerusalem. The blind superstition, and abject slavery, of those unfortunate exiles, must excite the contempt of a philosophic emperor; but they deserved the friendship of Julian, by their implacable hatred of the Christian name. The barren synagogue abhorred and envied the fecundity of the rebellious church: the power of the Jews was not equal to their malice; but their gravest rabbis approved the private murder of an apostate;[3] and their seditious clamours had often awakened the indolence of the pagan magistrates. Under the reign of Constantine, the Jews became the subjects of their revolted children, nor was it long before they experienced the bitterness of domestic tyranny. The civil immunities which had been granted, or confirmed, by Severus, were gradually repealed by the

[1] Greg. (Orat. iii. p. 74, 75. 83—86.) and Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. lxxxi, lxxxii. p. 307.) *περι ταυτην την σπουδην, ουκ αρνουμαι πλουτον ανηλωσθαι μεγαν.* The sophist owns and justifies the expence of these military conversions.

[2] Julian's epistle (xxv.) is addressed to the community of the Jews. Aldus (Venet. 1499.) has branded it with an *ει γνησιος*; but this stigma is justly removed by the subsequent editors, Petavius and Spanheim. The epistle is mentioned by Sozom. (l. v. c. 22.), and the purport of it is confirmed by Greg. (Orat. iv. 111.), and by Julian himself, Fragment, p. 295.

[3] The Misnah denounced death against those who abandoned the foundation. The judgment of zeal is explained by Marsham (Canon. Chron. p. 161. ed. Lon. 1672.) and Basnage (Hist. des Juifs, viii. 120.). Constantine made a law to protect Christian converts from Judaism. Cod. Theod. l. xvi. tit. viii. leg. 1. Godefroy, vi. 215.

Christian princes; and a rash tumult excited by the Jews of Palestine,[1] seemed to justify the lucrative modes of oppression, which were invented by the bishops and eunuchs of the court of Constantius. The Jewish patriarch, who was still permitted to exercise a precarious jurisdiction, held his residence at Tiberias;[2] and the neighbouring cities of Palestine were filled with the remains of a people, who fondly adhered to the promised land. But the edict of Hadrian was renewed and enforced; and they viewed from afar the walls of the holy city, which were profaned in their eyes by the triumph of the cross, and the devotion of the Christians.[3]

In the midst of a rocky and barren country, the walls of Jerusalem[4] inclosed the two mountains of Sion and Acra, within an oval figure of about three English miles.[5] Towards the south, the upper town, and the fortress of David, were erected on the lofty ascent of Mount Sion; on the north side, the buildings of the lower town covered the spacious summit of Mount Acra; and a part of the hill, distinguished by the name of Moriah, and levelled by human industry, was crowned with the stately temple of the Jewish nation. After the final destruction of the temple, by the arms of Titus and Hadrian, a plough-share was drawn over the consecrated gound, as a sign of perpetual interdiction. Sion was deserted: and the vacant space of the lower city was filled with the public and private edifices of the Ælian colony, which spread themselves over the adjacent hill of Calvary. The holy places were polluted with monuments of idolatry; and, either from design or accident, a chapel was dedicated to Venus, on the spot which had been sanctified by the death and resurrection of Christ.[6] Almost three hundred years after those stupendous events, the profane chapel of Venus was demolished by the order of Constantine; and the removal of the earth and stones revealed the holy sepulchre to the eyes of mankind. A magnificent church was erected on that mystic ground, by the first Christian emperor; and the effects of his pious munificence were extended to every spot, which had been consecrated by the footsteps of patriarchs, of prophets, and of the Son of God.[7]

The passionate desire of contemplating the original monuments of the redemption, attracted to Jerusalem a successive crowd of pilgrims, from the shores of the Atlantic ocean, and the most distant countries of the East;[8] and their piety was authorized by the example of the

[1] Et interea (during the civil war of Magnentius) Judæorum seditio, qui Patricium nefarie in regni speciem sustulerunt, oppressa. Aurel. Vict. in Constant. c. xlii. Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. iv. 379. 4to.

[2] The city and synagogue of Tiberias are curiously described by Reland. Palestin. ii. 1036.

[3] Basnage has fully illustrated the state of the Jews under Constantine and his successors (viii. c. iv. 111.).

[4] Reland (Palestin. l. i. 309. 390. l. iii. 838.) describes, with learning and perspicuity, Jerusalem and the face of the adjacent country.

[5] I have consulted a rare and curious treatise of M. d'Anville (sur l'anc. Jerus. Paris, 1747, p. 75.). The circumference of the ancient city (Euseb. Prepar. Evang. l. ix. c. 36.) was 27 stadia, or 2550 *toises*. A plan, taken on the spot, assigns no more than 1980 for the modern town. The circuit is defined by natural landmarks, which cannot be mistaken, or removed.

[6] See two curious passages in Jerom (i. 102. vi. 315.), and the ample details of Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. i. 569. ii. 289. 4to ed.).

[7] Euseb. Vit. Constan. l. iii. c. 25—47. 51—53. The emperor likewise built churches at Bethlem, the Mount of Olives, and the oak of Mamre. The holy sepulchre is described by Sandys (Travels, p. 125.), and curiously delineated by Le Bruyn (Voyage au Levant, 288.).

[8] The Itinerary from Bordeaux to Jerusalem, was composed in the year 333, for the use of

empress Helena; who appears to have united the credulity of age with the warm feelings of a recent conversion. Sages and heroes, who have visited the memorable scenes of ancient wisdom or glory, have confessed the inspiration of the genius of the place;[1] and the Christian, who knelt before the holy sepulchre, ascribed his lively faith, and his fervent devotion, to the more immediate influence of the Divine spirit. The zeal, perhaps the avarice, of the clergy at Jerusalem, cherished and multiplied these beneficial visits. They fixed, by unquestionable tradition, the scene of each memorable event. They exhibited the instruments which had been used in the passion of Christ; the nails and the lance that had pierced his hands, his feet, and his side; the crown of thorns that was planted on his head; the pillar at which he was scourged; and, above all, they showed the cross on which he suffered, and which was dug out of the earth in the reign of those princes, who inserted the symbol of Christianity in the banners of the Roman legions.[2] Such miracles, as seemed necessary to account for its extraordinary preservation, and seasonable discovery, were gradually propagated without opposition. The custody of the *true cross*, which on Easter Sunday was solemnly exposed to the people, was entrusted to the bishop of Jerusalem; and he alone might gratify the curious devotion of the pilgrims, by the gift of small pieces, which they enchased in gold or gems, and carried away in triumph to their respective countries. But as this gainful branch of commerce must soon have been annihilated, it was found convenient to suppose, that the marvellous wood possessed a secret power of vegetation; and that its substance, though continually diminished, still remained entire and unimpaired.[3] It might perhaps have been expected, that the influence of the place, and the belief of a perpetual miracle, should have produced some salutary effects on the morals, as well as on the faith, of the people. Yet the most respectable of the ecclesiastical writers have been obliged to confess, not only that the streets of Jerusalem were filled with the incessant tumult of business and pleasure,[4] but that every species of vice, adultery, theft, idolatry, poisoning, murder, was familiar to the inhabitants of the holy city.[5] The wealth and pre-eminence of the church of Jerusalem excited the ambition of Arian, as well as orthodox candidates; and the virtues of Cyril, who, since his

pilgrims; among whom Jerom (i. 126.) mentions the Britons and the Indians. The causes of this superstitious fashion are discussed in the learned and judicious preface of Wesseling (Itinerar. p. 537.).

[1] Cicero (de Finibus, v. 1.) has beautifully expressed the common sense of mankind.

[2] Baronius (Annal. Eccles. A.D. 326. No. 42—50.) and Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. vii. 8.) are the historians and champions of the *invention* of the cross, under the reign of Constantine. Their oldest witnesses are Paulinus, Sulpicius Severus, Rufinus, Ambrose, and perhaps Cyril of Jerusalem. The silence of Eusebius, and the Bordeaux pilgrim, which satisfies those who think, perplexes those who believe. See Jortin's sensible remarks, ii. 238.

[3] This multiplication is asserted by Paulinus (epist. xxxvi. Dupin. Bib. Eccles. iii. 149.), who seems to have improved a rhetorical flourish of Cyril into a real fact. The same supernatural privilege must have been communicated to the Virgin's milk (Erasmi Opera, i. 778. Ludg. Batav. 1703. in Colloq. de Pereg. Relig. ergo), saints' heads, &c. and other relics, which were repeated in so many different churches.

[4] Jerom. (i. 103.), who resided in the neighbouring village of Bethlem, describes the vices of Jerusalem from his personal experience.

[5] Greg. Nyssen, apud Wessel. p. 539. The whole epistle, which condemns either the use or abuse of religious pilgrimage, is painful to the Catholic divines; while it is dear and familiar to our Protestant polemics.

death, has been honoured with the title of Saint, were displayed in the exercise, rather than in the acquisition, of his episcopal dignity.[1]

The vain and ambitious mind of Julian might aspire to restore the ancient glory of the temple of Jerusalem.[2] As the Christians were firmly persuaded that a sentence of everlasting destruction had been pronounced against the whole fabric of the Mosaic law, the Imperial sophist would have converted the success of his undertaking into a specious argument against the faith of prophecy, and the truth of revelation.[3] He was displeased with the spiritual worship of the synagogue; but he approved the institutions of Moses. The local and national deity of the Jews was sincerely adored by a polytheist, who desired only to multiply the number of the gods;[4] and such was the appetite of Julian for bloody sacrifice, that his emulation might be excited by the piety of Solomon, who had offered, at the feast of the dedication, 22,000 oxen, and 120,000 sheep.[5] These considerations might influence his designs; but the prospect of an immediate and important advantage, would not suffer the impatient monarch to expect the remote and uncertain event of the Persian war. He resolved to erect, without delay, on the commanding eminence of Moriah, a stately temple, which might eclipse the splendour of the church of the Resurrection on the adjacent hill of Calvary; to establish an order of priests, whose interested zeal would detect the arts, and resist the ambition, of their Christian rivals; and to invite a numerous colony of Jews, whose stern fanaticism would be always prepared to second, and even to anticipate, the hostile measures of the pagan government. Among the friends of the emperor (if the names of emperor and of friend are not incompatible) the first place was assigned, by Julian himself, to the virtuous and learned Alypius.[6] The humanity of Alypius was tempered by severe justice and manly fortitude; and while he exercised his abilities in the civil administration of Britain, he imitated, in his poetical compositions, the harmony and softness of the odes of Sappho. This minister, to whom Julian communicated, without reserve, his most careless levities, and his most serious counsels, received an extraordinary commission to restore, in its pristine

[1] He renounced his orthodox ordination, officiated as a deacon, and was re-ordained by the hands of the Arians. But Cyril afterwards changed with the times, and prudently conformed to the Nicene faith. Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. viii.), who treats his memory with tenderness and respect, has thrown his virtues into the text, and his faults into the notes, in decent obscurity, at the end of the volume.

[2] Imperii sui memoriam magnitudine operum gestiens propagare. Ammian. xxiii. 1. The temple of Jerusalem had been famous even among the Gentiles. *They* had many temples in each city (at Sichem 5, at Gaza 8, at Rome 424); but the wealth and religion of the Jewish nation was centred in one spot.

[3] The secret intentions of Julian are revealed by the late bishop of Gloucester. The discourse entitled *Julian* (2nd ed. Lon. 1751), is strongly marked with all the peculiarities which are imputed to the Warburtonian school.

[4] Julian (Frag. p. 295.) respectfully styles him μεγας θεος, and mentions him elsewhere (epist. lxiii.) with still higher reverence. He doubly condemns the Christians: for believing, and for renouncing the religion of the Jews. Their Deity was a *true*, but not the *only* God. Apud Cyril. l. ix. 305.

[5] 1 Kings viii. 63. 2 Chronicles vii. 5. Jos. Antiq. Jud. l. viii. c. 4. 431. ed. Havercamp. As the blood and smoke of so many hecatombs might be inconvenient, Lightfoot, the Christian rabbi, removes them by a miracle. Le Clerc (ad loca) is bold enough to suspect the fidelity of the numbers.

[6] Julian, epist. xxix, xxx. La Bleterie has neglected to translate the second of these epistles.

beauty, the temple of Jerusalem; and the diligence of Alypius required and obtained the strenuous support of the governor of Palestine. At the call of their great deliverer, the Jews, from all the provinces of the empire, assembled on the holy mountain of their fathers; and their insolent triumph alarmed and exasperated the Christian inhabitants of Jerusalem. The desire of rebuilding the temple has, in every age, been the ruling passion of the children of Israel. In this propitious moment the men forgot their avarice, and the women their delicacy; spades and pickaxes of silver were provided by the vanity of the rich, and the rubbish was transported in mantles of silk and purple. Every purse was opened in liberal contributions, every hand claimed a share in the pious labour; and the commands of a great monarch were executed by the enthusiasm of a whole people.[1]

Yet, on this occasion, the joint efforts of power and enthusiasm were unsuccessful; and the ground of the Jewish temple, which is now covered by a Mahometan mosque,[2] still continued to exhibit the same edifying spectacle of ruin and desolation. Perhaps the absence and death of the emperor, and the new maxims of a Christian reign, might explain the interruption of an arduous work, which was attempted only in the last six months of the life of Julian.[3] But the Christians entertained a natural and pious expectation, that, in this memorable contest, the honour of religion would be vindicated by some signal miracle. An earthquake, a whirlwind, and a fiery eruption, which overturned and scattered the new foundations of the temple, are attested, with some variations, by contemporary and respectable evidence.[4] This public event is described by Ambrose,[5] bishop of Milan, in an epistle to the emperor Theodosius, which must provoke the severe animadversion of the Jews; by the eloquent Chrysostom,[6] who might appeal to the memory of the elder part of his congregation at Antioch; and by Gregory Nazianzen,[7] who published his account of the miracle before the expiration of the same year. The last of these writers has boldly declared, that this præternatural event was not disputed by the infidels; and his assertion, strange as it may seem, is confirmed by the unexceptionable testimony of Ammianus Marcellinus.[8] The philo-

[1] See the zeal and impatience of the Jews in Greg. Naz. (Orat. iv. 111.) and Theodor. (l. iii. c. 20.).

[2] Built by Omar, the second Khalif, who died A.D. 644. This great mosque covers the whole consecrated ground of the Jewish temple, and constitutes almost a square of 760 *toises*, or one Roman mile in circumference. D'Anville Jerus. p. 45.

[3] Ammianus records the consuls of the year 363, before he proceeds to mention the *thoughts* of Julian. Templum . . . instaurare sumptibus *cogitabat* immodicis. Warburton has a secret wish to anticipate the design; but he must have understood, from former examples, that the execution of such a work would have demanded many years.

[4] The subsequent witnesses, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Philostorgius, &c. add contradictions, rather than authority. Compare the objections of Basnage (Hist. des Juifs, viii. 157.) with Warburton's answers (Julian, p. 174—258.). The bishop has ingeniously explained the miraculous crosses which appeared on the garments of the spectators by a similar instance, and the natural effects of lightning.

[5] Ambros. ii. epist. xl. 946. ed. Benedict. He composed this fanatic epistle (A.D. 388.) to justify a bishop, who had been condemned by the civil magistrate for burning a synagogue.

[6] Chrysost. i. 580. advers. Judæos et Gentes, ii. 574. de Sto. Babylâ, ed. Montfaucon. I have followed the common and natural supposition; but the learned Benedictine, who dates the composition of these sermons in the year 383, is confident they were never pronounced from the pulpit.

[7] Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 110. Το δε ουν περιβοητον πασι θαυμα, και ουδε τοις αθεοις αυτοις απιστουμενον λεξων ερχομαι.

[8] Ammian. xxiii. 1. Cum itaque rei fortiter instaret Alypius, juvaretque provinciæ rector

sophic soldier, who loved the virtues, without adopting the prejudices of his master, has recorded, in his judicious and candid history of his own times, the extraordinary obstacles which interrupted the restoration of the temple of Jerusalem. "Whilst Alypius, assisted by the "governor of the province, urged, with vigour and diligence, the exe- "cution of the work, horrible balls of fire breaking out near the found- "ations, with frequent and reiterated attacks, rendered the place, "from time to time, inaccessible to the scorched and blasted workmen; "and the victorious element continuing in this manner obstinately and "resolutely bent, as it were, to drive them to a distance, the under- "taking was abandoned." Such authority should satisfy a believing, and must astonish an incredulous, mind. Yet a philosopher may still require the original evidence of impartial and intelligent spectators. At this important crisis, any singular accident of nature would assume the appearance, and produce the effects, of a real prodigy. This glorious deliverance would be speedily improved and magnified by the pious art of the clergy of Jerusalem, and the active credulity of the Christian world; and, at the distance of twenty years, a Roman historian, careless of theological disputes, might adorn his work with the splendid miracle.[1]

The restoration of the Jewish temple was secretly connected with the ruin of the Christian church. Julian still continued to maintain the freedom of religious worship, without distinguishing whether this universal toleration proceeded from his justice or his clemency. He affected to pity the unhappy Christians, who were mistaken in the most important object of their lives; but his pity was degraded by contempt, his contempt was embittered by hatred; and the sentiments of Julian were expressed in a style of sarcastic wit, which inflicts a deep and deadly wound, whenever it issues from the mouth of a sovereign. As he was sensible that the Christians gloried in the name of their Redeemer, he countenanced, and perhaps enjoined, the use of the less honourable appellation of GALILÆANS.[2] He declared, that, by the folly of the Galilæans, whom he describes as a sect of fanatics, contemptible to men, and odious to the gods, the empire had been reduced to the brink of destruction; and he insinuates in a public edict, that a frantic patient might sometimes be cured by salutary violence.[3] An ungenerous distinction was admitted into the mind and counsels of Julian, that, according to the difference of their religious sentiments, one part of his subjects deserved his favour and friendship,

metuendi globi flammarum prope fundamenta crebris assultibus erumpentes fecere locum exustis aliquoties operantibus inaccessum: hocque modo elemento destinatius repellente, cessavit inceptum. Warburton labours (p. 60—90.) to extort a confession of the miracle from the mouths of Julian and Libanius, and to employ the evidence of a rabbi, who lived in the fifteenth century. Such witnesses can only be received by a very favourable judge.

[1] Dr. Lardner, perhaps alone of the Christian critics, presumes to doubt the truth of this famous miracle (Jewish and Heath. Test. iv. 47.). The silence of Jerom would lead to a suspicion, that the same story, which was celebrated at a distance, might be despised on the spot.

[2] Greg. Naz. Orat. iii. 81. And this law was confirmed by the invariable practice of Julian himself. Warburton has justly observed (p. 35.), that the Platonists believed in the mysterious virtue of words; and Julian's dislike for the name of Christ might proceed from superstition, as well as from contempt.

[3] Frag. Julian. p. 288. He derides the μορια Γαλιλαιων (Epist. vii.), and so far loses sight of the principles of toleration, as to wish (Epist. xlii.) ἀκοντας ιασθαι.

while the other was entitled only to the common benefits that his justice could not refuse to an obedient people.[1] According to a principle pregnant with mischief and oppression, the emperor transferred, to the pontiffs of his own religion, the management of the liberal allowances from the public revenue, which had been granted to the church by the piety of Constantine and his sons. The proud system of clerical honours and immunities, which had been constructed with so much art and labour, was levelled to the ground; the hopes of testamentary donations were intercepted by the rigour of the laws; and the priests of the Christian sect were confounded with the last and most ignominious class of the people. Such of these regulations as appeared necessary to check the ambition and avarice of the ecclesiastics, were soon afterwards imitated by the wisdom of an orthodox prince. The peculiar distinctions which policy has bestowed, or superstition has lavished, on the sacerdotal order, *must* be confined to those priests who profess the religion of the state. But the will of the legislator was not exempt from prejudice and passion; and it was the object of the insidious policy of Julian, to deprive the Christians of all the temporal honours and advantages which rendered them respectable in the eyes of the world.[2]

A just and severe censure has been inflicted on the law which prohibited the Christians from teaching the arts of grammar and rhetoric.[3] The motives alleged by the emperor to justify this partial and oppressive measure, might command, during his life-time, the silence of slaves and the applause of flatterers. Julian abuses the ambiguous meaning of a word which might be indifferently applied to the language and the religion of the GREEKS: he contemptuously observes, that the men who exalt the merit of implicit faith are unfit to claim or to enjoy the advantages of science; and he vainly contends, that if they refuse to adore the gods of Homer and Demosthenes, they ought to content themselves with expounding Luke and Matthew in the churches of the Galilæans.[4] In all the cities of the Roman world, the education of the youth was entrusted to masters of grammar and rhetoric; who were elected by the magistrates, maintained at the public expence, and distinguished by many lucrative and honourable privileges. The edict of Julian appears to have included the physicians, and professors of all the liberal arts; and the emperor, who reserved to himself the approbation of the candidates, was authorized

[1] *Ου γαρ μοι θεμις εστι κομίζεμεν η ελεαιρειν*
Ανδρας, οι κε θεοισιν απεχθωντ' αθανατοισιν.

These two lines, which Julian has changed and perverted in the true spirit of a bigot (Epist. xlix.), are taken from the speech of Æolus, when he refuses to grant Ulysses a fresh supply of winds. Odyss. x. 73. Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. lix. 286.) attempts to justify this partial behaviour, by an apology, in which persecution peeps through the mask of candour.

[2] These laws which affected the clergy, may be found in the slight hints of Julian himself (Epist. lii.), in the vague declamations of Greg. (Orat. iii. 86.), and in the positive assertions of Sozom. (l. v. c. 5.).

[3] Inclemens . . . perenni obruendum silentio. Ammian. xxii. 10. xxv. 5.

[4] The edict itself, which is still extant among the epistles of Julian (xlii.), may be compared with the loose invectives of Gregory (Orat. iii. p. 96.). Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. vii. 1291.) has collected the seeming differences of ancients and moderns. They may be easily reconciled. The Christians were *directly* forbid to teach, they were *indirectly* forbid to learn; since they would not frequent the schools of the Pagans.

by the laws to corrupt, or to punish, the religious constancy of the most learned of the Christians.[1] As soon as the resignation of the more obstinate[2] teachers had established the unrivalled dominion of the Pagan sophists, Julian invited the rising generation to resort with freedom to the public schools, in a just confidence, that their tender minds would receive the impressions of literature and idolatry. If the greatest part of the Christian youth should be deterred by their own scruples, or by those of their parents, from accepting this dangerous mode of instruction, they must, at the same time, relinquish the benefits of a liberal education. Julian had reason to expect that, in the space of a few years, the church would relapse into its primæval simplicity, and that the theologians, who possessed an adequate share of the learning and eloquence of the age, would be succeeded by a generation of blind and ignorant fanatics, incapable of defending the truth of their own principles, or of exposing the various follies of Polytheism.[3]

It was undoubtedly the wish and the design of Julian to deprive the Christians of the advantages of wealth, of knowledge, and of power; but the injustice of excluding them from all offices of trust and profit, seems to have been the result of his general policy, rather than the immediate consequence of any positive law.[4] Superior merit might deserve, and obtain, some extraordinary exceptions; but the greater part of the Christian officers were gradually removed from their employments in the state, the army, and the provinces. The hopes of future candidates were extinguished by the declared partiality of a prince, who maliciously reminded them, that it was unlawful for a Christian to use the sword, either of justice, or of war; and who studiously guarded the camp and the tribunals with the ensigns of idolatry. The powers of government were entrusted to the Pagans, who professed an ardent zeal for the religion of their ancestors; and as the choice of the emperor was often directed by the rules of divination, the favourites whom he preferred as the most agreeable to the gods, did not always obtain the approbation of mankind.—Ψηφω θεων και διδους και μη διδους. *Liban. Orat. Paren.* c. 88. 314. Under the administration of their enemies, the Christians had much to suffer, and more to apprehend. The temper of Julian was averse to cruelty; and the care of his reputation, which was exposed to the eyes of the universe, restrained the philosophic monarch from violating the laws of justice and toleration, which he himself had so recently established. But the provincial ministers of his authority were placed in a less

[1] Codex Theodos. l. xiii. tit. iii. de medicis et professoribus, leg. 5. (published June 17, received, at Spoleto in Italy, July 29, A.D. 363.) Godefroy's Illust. v. 31.

[2] Orosius celebrates their disinterested resolution, Sicut a majoribus nostris compertum habemus, omnes ubique propemodum . . . . officium quam fidem deserere maluerunt, vii. 30. Proæresius, a Christian sophist, refused to accept the partial favour of the emperor. Hieronym. in Chron. p. 185. ed. Scalig. Eunap. in Proæresio, p. 126.

[3] They had recourse to the expedient of composing books for their own schools. Within a few months Apollinaris produced his Christian imitations of Homer (a sacred history in 24 books), Pindar, Euripides, and Menander; and Sozomen is satisfied, that they equalled, or excelled, the originals.

[4] It was the instruction of Julian to his magistrates (Epist. vii.) προτιμασθαι μεν τοι τους θεοσεβεις και πανυ φημι δειν. Sozom. (l. v. c. 18.) and Socr. (l. iii. c. 13.) must be reduced to the standard of Greg. (Orat. iii. 95.), not less prone to exaggeration, but more restrained by the actual knowledge of his contemporary readers.

conspicuous station. In the exercise of arbitrary power, they consulted the wishes, rather than the commands, of their sovereign; and ventured to exercise a secret and vexatious tyranny against the sectaries, on whom they were not permitted to confer the honours of martyrdom. The emperor, who dissembled, as long as possible, his knowledge of the injustice that was exercised in his name, expressed his real sense of the conduct of his officers, by gentle reproofs and substantial rewards.[1]

The most effectual instrument of oppression, with which they were armed, was the law that obliged the Christians to make full and ample satisfaction for the temples which they had destroyed under the preceding reign. The zeal of the triumphant church had not always expected the sanction of the public authority; and the bishops, who were secure of impunity, had often marched, at the head of their congregations, to attack and demolish the fortresses of the prince of darkness. The consecrated lands, which had increased the patrimony of the sovereign or of the clergy, were clearly defined, and easily restored. But on these lands, and on the ruins of Pagan superstition, the Christians had frequently erected their own religious edifices: and as it was necessary to remove the church before the temple could be rebuilt, the justice and piety of the emperor were applauded by one party, while the other deplored and execrated his sacrilegious violence.[2] After the ground was cleared, the restitution of those stately structures, which had been levelled with the dust; and of the precious ornaments, which had been converted to Christian uses; swelled into a very large account of damages and debt. The authors of the injury had neither the ability nor the inclination to discharge this accumulated demand; and the impartial wisdom of a legislator would have been displayed in balancing the adverse claims and complaints, by an equitable and temperate arbitration. But the whole empire, and particularly the East, was thrown into confusion by the rash edicts of Julian; and the Pagan magistrates, inflamed by zeal and revenge, abused the rigorous privilege of the Roman law; which substitutes, in the place of his inadequate property, the person of the insolvent debtor. Under the preceding reign, Mark, bishop of Arethusa,[3] had laboured in the conversion of his people with arms more effectual than those of persuasion.[4] The magistrates required the full value of a temple which had been destroyed by his intolerant zeal: but as they were satisfied of his poverty, they desired only to bend his inflexible spirit to the promise of the slightest compensation.

[1] Greg. Naz. Orat. iii. 74. 91, 92. Socr. l. iii. c. 14. Theodor. l. iii. c. 6. Some drawback may however be allowed for the violence of *their* zeal, not less partial than the zeal of Julian.

[2] If we compare the gentle language of Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 60. p. 286.) with the passionate exclamations of Greg. (Orat. iii. 86.), we may find it difficult to persuade ourselves, that the two orators are really describing the same events.

[3] Restan or Arethusa, at the equal distance of 16 miles between Emesa (*Hems*), and Epiphania (*Hamath*), was founded, or at least named, by Seleucus Nicator. Its peculiar æra dates from the year of Rome 685; according to the medals of the city. In the decline of the Seleucides, Emesa and Arethusa were usurped by the Arab Sampsiceramus, whose posterity, the vassals of Rome, were not extinguished in the reign of Vespasian. D'Anville's Maps and Geog. Anc. ii. 134. Wessel. Itin. p. 188. and Noris. Epoch. Syro-Macedon. p. 80. 481

[4] Soz. l. v. c. 10. It is surprising, that Gregory and Theodoret should suppress a circumstance, which, in their eyes, must have enhanced the religious merit of the confessor.

They apprehended the aged prelate, they inhumanly scourged him, they tore his beard; and his naked body, anointed with honey, was suspended, in a net, between heaven and earth, and exposed to the stings of insects and the rays of a Syrian sun.[1] From this lofty station, Mark still persisted to glory in his crime, and to insult the impotent rage of his persecutors. He was at length rescued from their hands, and dismissed to enjoy the honour of his divine triumph. The Arians celebrated the virtue of their pious confessor; the Catholics ambitiously claimed his alliance;[2] and the Pagans, who might be susceptible of shame or remorse, were deterred from the repetition of such unavailing cruelty.[3] Julian spared his life: but if the bishop of Arethusa had saved the infancy of Julian,[4] posterity will condemn the ingratitude, instead of praising the clemency, of the emperor.

At the distance of five miles from Antioch, the Macedonian kings of Syria had consecrated to Apollo one of the most elegant places of devotion in the Pagan world.[5] A magnificent temple rose in honour of the god of light; and his colossal figure[6] almost filled the capacious sanctuary, which was enriched with gold and gems, and adorned by the skill of the Grecian artists. The deity was represented in a bending attitude, with a golden cup in his hand, pouring out a libation on the earth; as if he supplicated the venerable mother to give to his arms the cold and beauteous DAPHNE: for the spot was ennobled by fiction; and the fancy of the Syrian poets had transported the amorous tale from the banks of the Peneus to those of the Orontes. The ancient rites of Greece were imitated by the royal colony of Antioch. A stream of prophecy, which rivalled the truth and reputation of the Delphic oracle, flowed from the *Castalian* fountain of Daphne.[7] In the adjacent fields a stadium was built by a special privilege,[8] which had been purchased from Elis; the Olympic

[1] The sufferings and constancy of Mark, which Gregory has so tragically painted (Orat. iii. 88.), are confirmed by the unexceptionable and reluctant evidence of Libanius. Μαρκος εκεινος κρεμαμενος, και μαστιγουμενος, και του πωγωνος αυτῳ τιλλομενου, παντα ενεγκων ανδρειως νυν ισοθεος εστι ταις τιμαις, καν φανη που, περιμαχητος ευθυς. Epist. 730. p. 350. edit. Wolf. Amstel. 1738.

[2] Περιμαχητος, certatim eum sibi (Christiani) vindicant. It is thus that La Croze and Wolfius (ad loc.) have explained a Greek word, whose true signification had been mistaken by former interpreters, and even by Le Clerc (Bib. Anc. et Mod. iii. 371.). Yet Tillemont is strangely puzzled to understand (Mem. Eccles. vii. 1309.) *how* Gregory and Theodoret could mistake a Semi-Arian bishop for a saint.

[3] See the probable advice of Sallust (Greg. Naz. Orat. iii. 90.). Libanius intercedes for a similar offender, lest they should find many *Marks*; yet he allows, that if Orion had secreted the consecrated wealth, he deserved to suffer the punishment of Marsyas; to be flayed alive (Epist. 730. p. 49—351.).

[4] Gregory (Orat. iii. 90.) is satisfied, that by saving the apostate, Mark had deserved still more than he had suffered.

[5] The grove and temple of Daphne are described by Strabo (l. xvi. 1089. ed. Amst. 1707.), Liban. (Nænia, p. 185. Antiochic. Orat. xi. 380.), and Soz. (l. v. c. 19.). Wesseling (Itin. p. 581.), and Casaubon (ad Hist. Aug. p. 64.) illustrate this curious subject.

[6] Simulacrum in eo Olympiaci Jovis imitamenti æquiparans magnitudinem. Ammian. xxii. 13. The Olympic Jupiter was 60 feet high, and his bulk was consequently equal to that of 1000 men. *Mem.* of the Abbé Gedoyn (Acad. des Inscrip. 198.).

[7] Adrian read the history of his future fortunes on a leaf dipped in the Castalian stream: a trick, which, according to the physician Vandale (de Oraculis, p. 281.), might be easily performed by chemical preparations. The emperor stopped the source of such dangerous knowledge; which was again opened by the devout curiosity of Julian.

[8] It was purchased, A.D. 44, in the year 92 of the æra of Antioch (Noris. Epoch Syro-Maced. p. 139.) for the term of ninety Olympiads. But the Olympic games of Antioch were not regularly celebrated till the reign of Commodus. Chron. of John Malala (i. 290. 320.

games were celebrated at the expence of the city; and a revenue of £30,000 was annually applied to the public pleasures.[1] The perpetual resort of pilgrims and spectators insensibly formed, in the neighbourhood of the temple, the stately and populous village of Daphne, which emulated the splendour, without acquiring the title, of a provincial city. The temple and the village were deeply bosomed in a thick grove of laurels and cypresses, which reached as far as a circumference of ten miles, and formed in the most sultry summers a cool and impenetrable shade. A thousand streams of the purest water, issuing from every hill, preserved the verdure of the earth, and the temperature of the air; the senses were gratified with harmonious sounds and aromatic odours; and the peaceful grove was consecrated to health and joy, to luxury and love. The soldier and the philosopher wisely avoided the temptation of this sensual paradise:[2] where pleasure, assuming the character of religion, imperceptibly dissolved the firmness of manly virtue. But the groves of Daphne continued for many ages to enjoy the veneration of natives and strangers; the privileges of the holy ground were enlarged by the munificence of succeeding emperors; and every generation added new ornaments to the splendour of the temple.[3]

When Julian, on the day of the annual festival, hastened to adore the Apollo of Daphne, his devotion was raised to the highest pitch of eagerness and impatience. His lively imagination anticipated the grateful pomp of victims, of libations, and of incense; a long procession of youths and virgins, clothed in white robes, the symbol of their innocence; and the tumultuous concourse of an innumerable people. But the zeal of Antioch was diverted, since the reign of Christianity, into a different channel. Instead of hecatombs of fat oxen sacrificed by the tribes of a wealthy city, to their tutelar deity, the emperor complains that he found only a single goose, provided at the expense of a priest, the pale and solitary inhabitant of this decayed temple.[4] The altar was deserted, the oracle had been reduced to silence, and the holy ground was profaned by the introduction of Christian and funeral rites. After Babylas[5] (a bishop of Antioch, who died in prison in the persecution of Decius) had rested near a century in his grave, his body, by the order of the Cæsar Gallus, was transported into the midst of the grove of Daphne. A magnificent church was erected over his remains; a portion of the sacred lands was usurped for the maintenance of the clergy, and for the burial of

372—381.), a writer whose merit and authority are confined within the limits of his native city.

[1] Fifteen talents of gold, bequeathed by Sosibius, who died in the reign of Augustus. The theatrical merits of the Syrian cities, in the age of Constantine, are compared in the Expositio totius Mundi, p. 6. (Hudson, Geog. Minor, tom. iii.).

[2] Avidio Cassio Syriacos legiones dedi luxuriâ diffluentes et *Daphnicis* moribus. These are the words of the emperor Marcus Antoninus in an original letter preserved by his biographer in Hist. Aug. p. 41. Cassius dismissed or punished every soldier who was seen at Daphne.

[3] Aliquantum agrorum Daphnensibus dedit (*Pompey*), quo lucus ibi spatiosior fieret; delectatus amœnitate loci et aquarum abundantiâ. Eutrop. vi. 14. Sex. Rufus, de Provinciis, c. 16.

[4] Julian (Misop. p. 361.) discovers his own character with that *naïveté*, that unconscious simplicity, which always constitutes genuine humour.

[5] Babylas is named by Eusebius in the succession of the bishops of Antioch (Hist. Eccles. l. vi. c. 29. 39.). His triumph over two emperors (the first fabulous, the second historical) is diffusely celebrated by Chrysost. (ii. 536. ed. Montfaucon.). Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. ii part ii. 278. 459.) becomes almost a sceptic.

the Christians of Antioch, who were ambitious of lying at the feet of their bishop; and the priests of Apollo retired, with their affrighted and indignant votaries. As soon as another revolution seemed to restore the fortune of Paganism, the church of St. Babylas was demolished, and new buildings were added to the mouldering edifice which had been raised by the piety of Syrian kings. But the first and most serious care of Julian was to deliver his oppressed deity from the odious presence of the dead and living Christians, who had so effectually suppressed the voice of fraud or enthusiasm.[1] The scene of infection was purified, according to the forms of ancient rituals; the bodies were decently removed; and the ministers of the church were permitted to convey the remains of St. Babylas to their former habitation within the walls of Antioch. The modest behaviour which might have assuaged the jealousy of an hostile government, was neglected on this occasion by the zeal of the Christians. The lofty car, that transported the relics of Babylas, was followed, and accompanied, and received, by an innumerable multitude; who chanted, with thundering acclamations, the Psalms of David the most expressive of their contempt for idols and idolaters. The return of the saint was a triumph; and the triumph was an insult on the religion of the emperor, who exerted his pride to dissemble his resentment. During the night which terminated this indiscreet procession, the temple of Daphne was in flames; the statue of Apollo was consumed; and the walls of the edifice were left a naked and awful monument of ruin. The Christians of Antioch asserted, with religious confidence, that the powerful intercession of St. Babylas had pointed the lightnings of heaven against the devoted roof: but as Julian was reduced to the alternative, of believing either a crime or a miracle, he choose, without hesitation, without evidence, but with some colour of probability, to impute the fire of Daphne to the revenge of the Galilæans.[2] Their offence, had it been sufficiently proved, might have justified the retaliation, which was immediately executed by the order of Julian, of shutting the doors, and confiscating the wealth, of the cathedral of Antioch. To discover the criminals who were guilty of the tumult, of the fire, or of secreting the riches of the church, several ecclesiastics were tortured;[3] and a presbyter, of the name of Theodoret, was beheaded by the sentence of the Count of the East. But this hasty act was blamed by the emperor; who lamented, with real or affected concern, that the imprudent zeal of his ministers would tarnish his reign with the disgrace of persecution.[4]

[1] Ecclesiastical critics, particularly those who love relics, exult in the confession of Julian (Misop. p. 361.) and Liban. (Nænia, p. 185.), that Apollo was disturbed by the vicinity of *one* dead man. Yet Ammian. (xxii. 12.) clears and purifies the whole ground, according to the rites which the Athenians formerly practised in the isle of Delos.

[2] Julian (Misop. p. 361.) rather insinuates, than affirms, their guilt. Ammianus (xxii. 13.) treats the imputation as *levissimus rumor*, and relates the story with extraordinary candour.

[3] Quo tam atroci casû repente consumpto, ad id usque imperatoris ira provexit, ut quæstiones agitare juberet solito acriores (yet Julian blames the lenity of the magistrates of Antioch), et majorem ecclesiam Antiochiæ claudi. This interdiction was performed with some circumstances of indignity and profanation: and the seasonable death of the principal actor, Julian's uncle, is related with much superstitious complacency by La Bleterie. Vie de Julien, p. 362.

[4] Besides the ecclesiastical historians, who are more or less to be suspected, we may allege the passion of St. Theodore, in the Acta Sincera of Ruinart, p. 591. The complaint of Julian gives it an original and authentic air.

The zeal of the ministers of Julian was instantly checked by the frown of their sovereign; but when the father of his country declares himself the leader of a faction, the licence of popular fury cannot easily be restrained, nor consistently punished. Julian, in a public composition, applauds the devotion and loyalty of the holy cities of Syria, whose pious inhabitants had destroyed, at the first signal, the sepulchres of the Galilæans; and faintly complains, that they had revenged the injuries of the gods with less moderation than he should have recommended.—*Julian. Misop.* p. 361. This imperfect and reluctant confession may appear to confirm the ecclesiastical narratives; that in the cities of Gaza, Ascalon, Cæsarea, Heliopolis, &c. the Pagans abused, without prudence or remorse, the moment of their prosperity. That the unhappy objects of their cruelty were released from torture only by death; that as their mangled bodies were dragged through the streets, they were pierced (such was the universal rage) by the spits of cooks, and the distaffs of enraged women; and that the entrails of Christian priests and virgins, after they had been tasted by those bloody fanatics, were mixed with barley, and contemptuously thrown to the unclean animals of the city.[1] Such scenes of religious madness exhibit the most contemptible and odious picture of human nature; but the massacre of Alexandria attracts still more attention, from the certainty of the fact, the rank of the victims, and the splendour of the capital of Egypt.

George,[2] from his parents or his education, surnamed the Cappadocian, was born at Epiphania in Cilicia, in a fuller's shop. From this obscure and servile origin he raised himself by the talents of a parasite: and the patrons, whom he assiduously flattered, procured for their worthless dependent a lucrative commission, or contract, to supply the army with bacon. His employment was mean: he rendered it infamous. He accumulated wealth by the basest arts of fraud and corruption; but his malversations were so notorious, that George was compelled to escape from the pursuits of justice. After this disgrace, in which he appears to have saved his fortune at the expence of his honour, he embraced, with real or affected zeal, the profession of Arianism. From the love, or the ostentation, of learning, he collected a valuable library of history, rhetoric, philosophy, and theology;[3] and the choice of the prevailing faction promoted George of Cappadocia to the throne of Athanasius. The entrance of the new archbishop was that of a Barbarian conqueror; and each moment of his reign was

[1] Greg. Naz. (Orat. iii. 87.). Soz. (l. v. c. 9.) may be considered as an original, though not impartial, witness. He was a native of Gaza, and had conversed with the confessor Zeno, who, as bishop of Maiuma, lived to the age of an hundred (l. vii. c. 28.). Philostor. (l. vii. c. 4. Godefroy's Dissert.) adds some tragic circumstances, of Christians, who were *literally* sacrificed at the altars of the gods, &c.

[2] The life and death of George of Cappadocia are described by Ammian. (xxii. 11.), Greg. Naz. (Orat. xxi. 382.), and Epiphan. (Hæres. lxxvi.). The invectives of the two saints might not deserve much credit, unless they were confirmed by the testimony of the cool and impartial infidel.

[3] After the massacre of George, the emperor Julian repeatedly sent orders to preserve the library for his own use, and to torture the slaves who might be suspected of secreting any books. He praises the merit of the collection, from whence he had borrowed and transcribed several manuscripts while he pursued his studies in Cappadocia. He could wish indeed that the works of the Galilæans might perish; but he requires an exact account even of those theological volumes, lest other treatises more valuable should be confounded in their loss. Julian. Epist. ix. xxxvi.

polluted by cruelty and avarice. The Catholics of Alexandria and Egypt were abandoned to a tyrant, qualified, by nature and education, to exercise the office of persecution; but he oppressed with an impartial hand the various inhabitants of his extensive diocese. The primate of Egypt assumed the pomp and insolence of his lofty station; but he still betrayed the vices of his base and servile extraction. The merchants of Alexandria were impoverished by the unjust, and almost universal, monopoly, which he acquired, of nitre, salt, paper, funerals, &c.: and the spiritual father of a great people condescended to practise the vile and pernicious arts of an informer. The Alexandrians could never forget, nor forgive, the tax, which he suggested, on all the houses of the city; under an obsolete claim, that the royal founder had conveyed to his successors, the Ptolemies and the Cæsars, the perpetual property of the soil. The Pagans, who had been flattered with the hopes of freedom and toleration, excited his devout avarice; and the rich temples of Alexandria were either pillaged or insulted by the haughty prelate, who exclaimed, in a loud and threatening tone, "How long will "these sepulchres be permitted to stand?" Under the reign of Constantius, he was expelled by the fury, or rather by the justice, of the people; and it was not without a violent struggle, that the civil and military powers of the state could restore his authority, and gratify his revenge. The messenger who proclaimed at Alexandria the accession of Julian (A. D. 361. Nov. 30), announced the downfall of the archbishop. George, with two of his obsequious ministers, count Diodorus, and Dracontius, master of the mint, were ignominiously dragged in chains to the public prison. At the end of twenty-four days (Dec. 24), the prison was forced open by the rage of a superstitious multitude, impatient of the tedious forms of judicial proceedings. The enemies of gods and men expired under their cruel insults; the lifeless bodies of the archbishop and his associates were carried in triumph through the streets on the back of a camel; and the inactivity of the Athanasian party[1] was esteemed a shining example of evangelical patience. The remains of these guilty wretches were thrown into the sea; and the popular leaders of the tumult declared their resolution to disappoint the devotion of the Christians, and to intercept the future honours of these *martyrs*, who had been punished, like their predecessors, by the enemies of their religion.[2] The fears of the Pagans were just, and their precautions ineffectual. The meritorious death of the archbishop obliterated the memory of his life. The rival of Athanasius was dear and sacred to the Arians, and the seeming conversion of those sectaries introduced his worship into the bosom of the Catholic church.[3] The odious stranger, disguising every circumstance of time and place, assumed the mask of a martyr, a saint, and a Christian hero;[4] and

[1] Philostorgius, with cautious malice, insinuates their guilt, *και του Αθανασιου γνομην στρατηγησαι της πραξεως*, l. vii. c. 2. Godefroy, p. 267.

[2] Cineres projecit in mare, id metuens ut clamabat, ne, collectis supremis, ædes illis exstruerent; ut reliquis, qui deviare a religione compulsi, pertulere cruciabiles pœnas, adusque gloriosam mortem intemeratâ fide progressi, et nunc MARTYRES appellantur. Ammian. xxii. 11. Epiphanius proves to the Arians, that George was not a martyr.

[3] Some Donatists (Optatus Milev. p. 60. 303. ed. Dupin; Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. vi. 713.) and Priscillianists (Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. viii. 517) have in like manner usurped the honours of Catholic saints and martyrs.

[4] The saints of Cappadocia, Basil and the Gregories, were ignorant of their holy companion.

the infamous George of Cappadocia has been transformed[1] into the renowned St. George of England, the patron of arms, of chivalry, and of the garter.[2]

About the same time that Julian was informed of the tumult of Alexandria, he received intelligence from Edessa, that the proud and wealthy faction of the Arians had insulted the weakness of the Valentinians; and committed such disorders, as ought not to be suffered with impunity in a well-regulated state. Without expecting the slow forms of justice, the exasperated prince directed his mandate to the magistrates of Edessa (*Julian.* Epist. xliii.), by which he confiscated the whole property of the church: the money was distributed among the soldiers; the lands were added to the domain; and this act of oppression was aggravated by the most ungenerous irony. "I "show myself," says Julian, "the true friend of the Galilæans. Their "*admirable* law has promised the kingdom of heaven to the poor; and "they will advance with more diligence in the paths of virtue and "salvation, when they are relieved by my assistance from the load of "temporal possessions. Take care," pursued the monarch, in a more serious tone, "take care how you provoke my patience and humanity. "If these disorders continue, I will revenge on the magistrates the "crimes of the people; and you will have reason to dread, not only "confiscation and exile, but fire and the sword." The tumults of Alexandria were doubtless of a more bloody and dangerous nature: but a Christian bishop had fallen by the hands of the Pagans; and the public epistle of Julian affords a very lively proof of the partial spirit of his administration. His reproaches to the citizens of Alexandria are mingled with expressions of esteem and tenderness; and he laments, that, on this occasion, they should have departed from the gentle and generous manners which attested their Grecian extraction. He gravely censures the offence which they had committed against the laws of justice and humanity; but he recapitulates, with visible complacency, the intolerable provocations which they had so long endured from the impious tyranny of George of Cappadocia. Julian admits the principle, that a wise and vigorous government should chastise the insolence of the people: yet, in consideration of their founder Alexander, and of Serapis their tutelar deity, he grants a free and gracious pardon to the guilty city, for which he again feels the affection of a brother.[3]

After the tumult of Alexandria had subsided, Athanasius (A.D. 362. Feb. 21), amidst the public acclamations, seated himself on the throne from whence his unworthy competitor had been precipitated: and as

Pope Gelasius (A.D. 494.), the first Catholic who acknowledges St. George, places him among the martyrs, "qui Deo magis quam hominibus noti sunt." He rejects his Acts as the composition of heretics. Some, perhaps not the oldest, of the spurious Acts, are still extant; and, through a cloud of fiction, we may yet distinguish the combat which St. George of Cappadocia sustained in the presence of Queen *Alexandria*, against the *magician Athanasius*.

[1] This transformation is not given as absolutely certain, but as *extremely* probable. Longueruana, tom. i. 194.

[2] A curious history of the worship of St. George, from the sixth century (when he was already revered in Palestine, in Armenia, at Rome, and at Treves in Gaul), might be extracted from Dr. Heylin (Hist. of St. George, 2d ed. Lond. 1633.), and the Bollandists (Act. SS. Mens. April. iii. 100.). His fame and popularity in Europe, and especially in England, proceeded from the Crusades.

[3] Julian, Epist. x. He allowed his friends to assuage his anger. Ammian. xxii. 11.

the zeal of the archbishop was tempered with discretion, the exercise of his authority tended not to inflame, but to reconcile, the minds of the people. His pastoral labours were not confined to the narrow limits of Egypt. The state of the Christian world was present to his active and capacious mind; and the age, the merit, the reputation of Athanasius, enabled him to assume, in a moment of danger, the office of Ecclesiastical Dictator.[1] Three years were not yet elapsed since the majority of the bishops of the West had ignorantly, or reluctantly, subscribed the Confession of Rimini. They repented, they believed, but they dreaded the unseasonable rigour of their orthodox brethren; and if their pride was stronger than their faith, they might throw themselves into the arms of the Arians, to escape the indignity of a public penance, which must degrade them to the condition of obscure laymen. At the same time, the domestic differences concerning the union and distinction of the Divine persons, were agitated with some heat among the Catholic doctors; and the progress of this metaphysical controversy seemed to threaten a public and lasting division of the Greek and Latin churches. By the wisdom of a select synod, to which the name and presence of Athanasius gave the authority of a general council, the bishops, who had unwarily deviated into error, were admitted to the communion of the church, on the easy condition of subscribing the Nicene Creed; without any formal acknowledgment of their past fault, or any minute definition of their scholastic opinions. The advice of the primate of Egypt had already prepared the clergy of Gaul and Spain, of Italy and Greece, for the reception of this salutary measure; and, notwithstanding the opposition of some ardent spirits,[2] the fear of the common enemy promoted the peace and harmony of the Christians.[3]

The skill and diligence of the primate of Egypt had improved the season of tranquillity, before it was interrupted (A.D. 362. Oct. 23) by the hostile edicts of the emperor.[4] Julian, who despised the Christians, honoured Athanasius with his sincere and peculiar hatred. For his sake alone, he introduced an arbitrary distinction, repugnant, at least to the spirit, of his former declarations. He maintained, that the Galilæans, whom he had recalled from exile, were not restored, by that general indulgence, to the possession of their respective churches: and he expressed his astonishment, that a criminal, who had been repeatedly condemned by the judgment of the emperors, should dare to insult the majesty of the laws, and insolently usurp the archiepiscopal throne of Alexandria, without expecting the orders of his sovereign. As a punishment for the imaginary offence, he again banished Athanasius from the city; and he was pleased to suppose, that this act of

[1] Athanas. ad Rufin. ii. 40.; and Greg. Naz. Orat. iii. 395, who justly states the temperate zeal of the primate, as much more meritorious than his prayers, his fasts, his persecutions, &c.

[2] I have not leisure to follow the blind obstinacy of Lucifer of Cagliari. See his adventures in Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. vii. 900.); and observe how the colour of the narrative insensibly changes, as the confessor becomes a schismatic.

[3] Assensus est huic sententiæ Occidens, et, per tam necessarium concilium, Satanæ faucibus mundus ereptus. The lively and artful Dialogue of Jerom against the Luciferians (ii. 135.) exhibits an original picture of the ecclesiastical policy of the times.

[4] Tillemont, who supposes that George was massacred in August, crowds the actions of Athanasius into a narrow space (Mem. Eccles. viii. 360.). An original fragment, published by the marquis Maffei from the old Chapter-library of Verona (Osservaz. Let. iii. 60.) affords many important dates, which are authenticated by the computation of Egyptian months.

justice would be highly agreeable to his pious subjects. The pressing solicitations of the people soon convinced him, that the majority of the Alexandrians were Christians; and that the greatest part of the Christians were firmly attached to the cause of their oppressed primate. But the knowledge of their sentiments, instead of persuading him to recall his decree, provoked him to extend to all Egypt the term of the exile of Athanasius. The zeal of the multitude rendered Julian still more inexorable: he was alarmed by the danger of leaving at the head of a tumultuous city, a daring and popular leader; and the language of his resentment discovers the opinion which he entertained of the courage and abilities of Athanasius. The execution of the sentence was still delayed, by the caution or negligence of Ecdicius, præfect of Egypt, who was at length awakened from his lethargy by a severe reprimand. "Though you neglect," says Julian, "to write to me on "any other subject, at least it is your duty to inform me of your con-"duct towards Athanasius, the enemy of the gods. My intentions have "been long since communicated to you. I swear by the great Serapis, "that unless, on the calends of December, Athanasius has departed "from Alexandria, nay from Egypt, the officers of your government "shall pay a fine of one hundred pounds of gold. You know my "temper: I am slow to condemn, but I am still slower to forgive." This epistle was enforced by a short postscript, written with the emperor's own hand. "The contempt that is shown for all the gods fills "me with grief and indignation. There is nothing that I should see, "nothing that I should hear, with more pleasure, than the expulsion of "Athanasius from all Egypt. The abominable wretch! Under my "reign, the baptism of several Grecian ladies of the highest rank has "been the effect of his persecutions."[1] The death of Athanasius was not *expressly* commanded; but the præfect of Egypt understood, that it was safer for him to exceed than to neglect, the orders of an irritated master. The archbishop prudently retired to the monasteries of the Desert: eluded, with his usual dexterity, the snares of the enemy; and lived to triumph over the ashes of a prince, who, in words of formidable import, had declared his wish that the whole venom of the Galilæan school were contained in the single person of Athanasius.[2]

I have endeavoured faithfully to represent the artful system by which Julian proposed to obtain the effects, without incurring the guilt, or reproach, of persecution. But if the deadly spirit of fanaticism perverted the heart and understanding of a virtuous prince, it must, at the same time, be confessed, that the *real* sufferings of the Christians were inflamed and magnified by human passions and religious enthusiasm. The meekness and resignation which had distinguished the primitive disciples of the gospel, was the object of the applause, rather than of the imitation, of their successors. The Christians, who had now possessed above forty years the civil and ecclesiastical govern-

[1] *Τον μιᾶρον, ος ετολμησεν Ελληνιδας, επ' εμου, γυναικας των επισημων βαπτισαι διωκεσθαι.* I have preserved the ambiguous sense of the last word, the ambiguity of a tyrant who wished to find, or to create, guilt.

[2] The three Epistles of Julian, which explain his intentions and conduct with regard to Athanasius, should be disposed in the following chronological order, xxvi, x, vi. Greg. Naz. xxi. 393. Soz. l. v. c. 15. Socr. l. iii. c. 14. Theodor. l. iii. c. 9. and Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. viii. 361, who has used some materials prepared by the Bollandists.

ment of the empire, had contracted the insolent vices of prosperity (*Confession of Gregory*, Orat. iii. 61), and the habit of believing, that the saints alone were entitled to reign over the earth. As soon as the enmity of Julian deprived the clergy of the privileges which had been conferred by the favour of Constantine, they complained of the most cruel oppression; and the free toleration of idolaters and heretics was a subject of grief and scandal to the orthodox party.[1] The acts of violence, which were no longer countenanced by the magistrates, were still committed by the zeal of the people. At Pessinus, the altar of Cybele was overturned almost in the presence of the emperor; and in the city of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the temple of Fortune, the sole place of worship which had been left to the Pagans, was destroyed by the rage of a popular tumult. On these occasions, a prince, who felt for the honour of the gods, was not disposed to interrupt the course of justice; and his mind was still more deeply exasperated, when he found, that the fanatics, who had deserved and suffered the punishment of incendiaries, were rewarded with the honours of martyrdom.[2] The Christian subjects of Julian were assured of the hostile designs of their sovereign; and, to their jealous apprehension, every circumstance of his government might afford some grounds of discontent and suspicion. In the ordinary administration of the laws, the Christians, who formed so large a part of the people, must frequently be condemned: but their indulgent brethren, without examining the merits of the cause, presumed their innocence, allowed their claims, and imputed the severity of their judge to the partial malice of religious persecution.[3] These present hardships, intolerable as they might appear, were represented as a slight prelude of the impending calamities. The Christians considered Julian as a cruel and crafty tyrant; who suspended the execution of his revenge, till he should return victorious from the Persian war. They expected, that as soon as he had triumphed over the foreign enemies of Rome, he would lay aside the irksome mask of dissimulation; that the amphitheatres would stream with the blood of hermits and bishops; and that the Christians, who still persevered in the profession of the faith, would be deprived of the common benefit of nature and society.[4] Every calumny[5] that could wound the reputation of the Apostate, was credulously embraced by the fears and hatred of his adversaries; and their indiscreet clamours provoked the temper of a sovereign, whom it was their duty to respect, and their interest to flatter. They still pro-

[1] Hear the furious and absurd complaint of Optatus (de Schismat. Donatist. l. ii. c. 16, 17.).

[2] Greg. Naz. Orat. iii. 91. iv. 133. He praises the rioters of Cæsarea, *τουτων δε των μεγαλοφυων και θερμων εις Ευσεβειαν*. See Sozomen, l. v. 4. 11. Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. vii. 649.) owns, that their behaviour was not dans l'ordre commun; but he is perfectly satisfied, as the great St. Basil always celebrated the festival of these blessed martyrs.

[3] Julian determined a law-suit against the new Christian city at Maiuma, the port of Gaza; and his sentence, though it might be imputed to bigotry, was never reversed by his successors. Soz. l. v. c. 3. Reland, Palestin. ii. 791.

[4] Greg. (Orat. iii. 93. Orat. iv. 114.) pretends to speak from the information of Julian's confidents, whom Oros. (vii. 30.) could not have seen.

[5] Greg. (Orat. iii. 91.) charges the Apostate with secret sacrifices of boys and girls; and positively affirms, that the dead bodies were thrown into the Orontes. Theod. l. iii. c. 26; and the equivocal candour of La Bleterie, Vie de Julien, p. 351. Yet *contemporary* malice could not impute to Julian the troops of martyrs, more especially in the West, which Baronius so greedily swallows, and Tillemont so faintly rejects (Mem. Eccles. vii. 1295.).

tested, that prayers and tears were their only weapons against the impious tyrant, whose head they devoted to the justice of offended Heaven. But they insinuated, with sullen resolution, that their submission was no longer the effect of weakness; and that, in the imperfect state of human virtue, the patience, which is founded on principle, may be exhausted by persecution. It is impossible to determine how far the zeal of Julian would have prevailed over his good sense and humanity: but, if we seriously reflect on the strength and spirit of the church, we shall be convinced, that, before the emperor could have extinguished the religion of Christ, he must have involved his country in the horrors of a civil war.[1]

CHAPTER XXIV.

Residence of Julian at Antioch.—His successful Expedition against the Persians.—Passage of the Tigris.—The Retreat and Death of Julian.—Election of Jovian.—He saves the Roman Army by a disgraceful Treaty.

THE philosophical fable which Julian composed under the name of the CÆSARS,[2] is one of the most agreeable and instructive productions of ancient wit.[3] During the freedom and equality of the days of the Saturnalia, Romulus prepared a feast for the deities of Olympus, who had adopted him as a worthy associate, and for the Roman princes, who had reigned over his martial people, and the vanquished nations of the earth. The immortals were placed in just order on their thrones of state, and the table of the Cæsars was spread below the Moon, in the upper region of the air. The tyrants, who would have disgraced the society of gods and men, were thrown headlong, by the inexorable Nemesis, into the Tartarean abyss. The rest of the Cæsars successively advanced to their seats; and, as they passed, the vices, the defects, the blemishes of their respective characters, were maliciously noticed by old Silenus, a laughing moralist, who disguised the wisdom of a philosopher under the mask of a Bacchanal.[4] As soon as the feast was ended, the voice of Mercury proclaimed the will of Jupiter, that a celestial crown should be the reward of superior merit. Julius Cæsar, Augustus, Trajan, and Marcus Antoninus, were

[1] The resignation of Gregory is truly edifying (Orat. iv. p. 123.). Yet, when an officer of Julian attempted to seize the church of Nazianzus, he would have lost his life, if he had not yielded to the zeal of the bishop and people (Orat. xix. 308.). See the reflections of Chrysostom, as they are alleged by Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. vii. 575.).

[2] See this fable or satire, p. 306—336. Leip. ed. Julian's works. The French version of the learned Ez. Spanheim (Paris, 1683.) is coarse, languid, and correct; and his notes, proofs, illustrations, &c. are piled on each other till they form a mass of 557 close-printed quarto pages. La Bleterie (Vie de Jov. i. 241.) has more happily expressed the spirit, as well as the sense, of the original, which he illustrates with some concise and curious notes.

[3] Spanheim (in his preface) has most learnedly discussed the etymology, origin, resemblance, and disagreement of the Greek *satyrs*, a dramatic piece, which was acted after the tragedy; and the Latin *satires* (from *Satura*) a *miscellaneous* composition, either in prose or verse. But the Cæsars of Julien are of such an original cast, that the critic is perplexed to which class he should ascribe them.

[4] This mixed character of Silenus is finely painted in Virgil, Eclog. 6.

selected as the most illustrious candidates; the effeminate Constantine [1] was not excluded from this honourable competition, and the great Alexander was invited to dispute the prize of glory with the Roman heroes. Each of the candidates was allowed to display the merit of his own exploits; but, in the judgment of the gods, the modest silence of Marcus pleaded more powerfully than the elaborate orations of his haughty rivals. When the judges of this awful contest proceeded to examine the heart, and to scrutinize the springs of action, the superiority of the Imperial Stoic appeared still more decisive and conspicuous.[2] Alexander and Cæsar, Augustus, Trajan, and Constantine, acknowledged with a blush, that fame, or power, or pleasure, had been the important object of *their* labours: but the gods themselves beheld, with reverence and love, a virtuous mortal, who had practised on the throne the lessons of philosophy; and who, in a state of human imperfection, had aspired to imitate the moral attributes of the Deity. The value of this agreeable composition (the Cæsars of Julian) is enhanced by the rank of the author. A prince, who delineates with freedom the vices and virtues of his predecessors, subscribes, in every line, the censure or approbation of his own conduct.

In the cool moments of reflection, Julian preferred the useful and benevolent virtues of Antoninus: but his ambitious spirit was inflamed by the glory of Alexander; and he solicited, with equal ardour, the esteem of the wise, and the applause of the multitude. In the season of life when the powers of the mind and body enjoy the most active vigour, the emperor, who was instructed by the experience, and animated by the success, of the German war, resolved (A.D. 362) to signalize his reign by some more splendid and memorable achievement. The ambassadors of the East, from the continent of India, and the isle of Ceylon,[3] had respectfully saluted the Roman purple.[4] The nations of the West esteemed and dreaded the personal virtues of Julian, both in peace and war. He despised the trophies of a Gothic victory,[5] and was satisfied that the rapacious Barbarians of the Danube would be restrained from any future violation of the faith

[1] Every impartial reader must perceive and condemn the partiality of Julian against his uncle Constantine, and the Christian religion. On this occasion, the interpreters are compelled, by a more sacred interest, to renounce their allegiance, and to desert the cause of their author.

[2] Julian was secretly inclined to prefer a Greek to a Roman. But when he seriously compared a hero with a philosopher, he was sensible that mankind had much greater obligations to Socrates than to Alexander (Orat. ad Themist. p. 264.).

[3] Inde nationibus Indicis certatim cum donis optimates mittentibus . . . ab usque Divis et *Serendivis*. Ammian. xx. 7. This island, to which the names of Taprobana, Serendib, and Ceylon, have been successively applied, manifests how imperfectly the seas and lands, to the east of cape Comorin, were known to the Romans. 1. Under the reign of Claudius, a freedman, who farmed the customs of the Red Sea, was accidentally driven by the winds upon this strange and undiscovered coast: he conversed six months with the natives; and the king of Ceylon, who heard, for the first time, of the power and justice of Rome, was persuaded to send an embassy to the emperor (Plin. Hist. Nat. vi. 24.). 2. The geographers (and even Ptolemy) have magnified, above fifteen times, the real size of this new world, which they extended as far as the equator, and the neighbourhood of China.

[4] These embassies had been sent to Constantius. Ammianus, who unwarily deviates into gross flattery, must have forgotten the length of the way, and the short duration of the reign of Julian.

[5] Gothos sæpe fallaces et perfidos; hostes quærere se meliores aiebat: illis enim sufficere mercatores Galatas per quos ubique sine conditionis discrimine venumdantur. Within less than fifteen years, these Gothic slaves threatened and subdued their masters.

of treaties, by the terror of his name, and the additional fortifications, with which he strengthened the Thracian and Illyrian frontiers. The successor of Cyrus and Artaxerxes was the only rival whom he deemed worthy of his arms; and he resolved, by the final conquest of Persia, to chastise the haughty nation, which had so long resisted and insulted the majesty of Rome.[1] As soon as the Persian monarch was informed that the throne of Constantius was filled by a prince of a very different character, he condescended to make some artful, or perhaps sincere, overtures, towards a negociation of peace. But the pride of Sapor was astonished by the firmness of Julian; who sternly declared, that he would never consent to hold a peaceful conference among the flames and ruins of the cities of Mesopotamia; and who added, with a smile of contempt, that it was needless to treat by ambassadors, as he himself had determined to visit speedily the court of Persia. The impatience of the emperor urged the diligence of the military preparations. The generals were named; a formidable army was destined for this important service; and Julian, marching from Constantinople through the provinces of Asia Minor, arrived at Antioch about eight months after the death of his predecessor. His ardent desire to march into the heart of Persia, was checked by the indispensable duty of regulating the state of the empire; by his zeal to revive the worship of the gods; and by the advice of his wisest friends; who represented the necessity of allowing the salutary interval of winter-quarters, to restore the exhausted strength of the legions of Gaul, and the discipline and spirit of the Eastern troops. Julian was persuaded to fix, till the ensuing spring, his residence at Antioch, among a people maliciously disposed to deride the haste, and to censure the delays, of their sovereign.[2]

If Julian had flattered himself, that his personal connexion with the capital of the East would be productive of mutual satisfaction to the prince and people, he made a very false estimate of his own character, and of the manners of Antioch.[3] The warmth of the climate disposed the natives to the most intemperate enjoyment of tranquillity and opulence; and the lively licentiousness of the Greeks was blended with the hereditary softness of the Syrians. Fashion was the only law, pleasure the only pursuit, and the splendour of dress and furniture was the only distinction of the citizens of Antioch. The arts of luxury were honoured; the serious and manly virtues were the subject of ridicule; and the contempt for female modesty and reverend age, announced the universal corruption of the capital of the East. The love of spectacles was the taste, or rather passion, of the Syrians: the most skilful artists were procured from the adjacent cities;[4] a considerable share of the revenue was devoted to the

[1] Alexander reminds his rival Cæsar, who depreciated the fame and merit of an Asiatic victory, that Crassus and Antony had felt the Persian arrows; and that the Romans, in a war of 300 years, had not yet subdued the single province of Mesopotamia or Assyria (Cæsares, p. 324.).

[2] The design of the Persian war is declared by Ammian. (xxii. 7. 12.), Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 79, 80. p. 305.), Zos. (l. iii. 158.), and Socr. (l. iii. c. 19.).

[3] The Satire of Julian, and the Homilies of St. Chrysostom, exhibit the same picture of Antioch. The miniature which La Bleterie has copied from thence (Vie de Julien, p. 332.), is elegant and correct.

[4] Laodicea furnished charioteers; Tyre and Berytus, comedians; Cæsarea, pantomimes;

public amusements; and the magnificence of the games of the theatre and circus was considered as the happiness and as the glory of Antioch. The rustic manners of a prince who disdained such glory, and was insensible of such happiness, soon disgusted the delicacy of his subjects; and the effeminate Orientals could neither imitate, nor admire, the severe simplicity which Julian always maintained and sometimes affected. The days of festivity consecrated, by ancient custom, to the honour of the gods, were the only occasions in which Julian relaxed his philosophic severity; and those festivals were the only days in which the Syrians of Antioch could reject the allurements of pleasure. The majority of the people supported the glory of the Christian name, which had been first invented by their ancestors;[1] they contented themselves with disobeying the moral precepts, but they were scrupulously attached to the speculative doctrines, of their religion. The church of Antioch was distracted by heresy and schism; but the Arians and the Athanasians, the followers of Meletius and those of Paulinus,[2] were actuated by the same pious hatred of their common adversary.

The strongest prejudice was entertained against the character of an apostate, the enemy and successor of a prince who had engaged the affections of a very numerous sect; and the removal of St. Babylas excited an implacable opposition to the person of Julian. His subjects complained, with superstitious indignation, that famine had pursued the emperor's steps from Constantinople to Antioch; and the discontent of a hungry people was exasperated by the injudicious attempt to relieve their distress. The inclemency of the season had affected the harvests of Syria; and the price of bread,[3] in the markets of Antioch, had naturally risen in proportion to the scarcity of corn. But the fair and reasonable proportion was soon violated by the rapacious arts of monopoly. In this unequal contest, in which the produce of the land is claimed by one party, as his exclusive property; is used by another as a lucrative object of trade; and is required by a third, for the daily and necessary support of life; all the profits of the intermediate agents are accumulated on the head of the defenceless consumers. The hardships of their situation were exaggerated and increased by their own impatience and anxiety; and the apprehension of a scarcity gradually produced the appearances of a famine. When the luxurious citizens of Antioch complained of the high price of poultry and fish, Julian publicly declared, that a frugal city ought to be satisfied with a regular

Heliopolis, singers; Gaza, gladiators; Ascalon, wrestlers; and Castabala, rope-dancers. Exposit. tot. Mundi, p. 6. tome 3. Hudson's Minor Geog.

[1] Χριστου δε αγαπωντες, εχετε πολιουχον αντι του Διος. The people of Antioch ingeniously professed their attachment to the *Chi* (Christ) and the *Kappa* (Constantius). Julian in Misop. p. 357.

[2] The schism of Antioch, which lasted 85 years (A.D. 330—415.), was inflamed, while Julian resided in that city, by the indiscreet ordination of Paulinus. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. vii. 603. of the quarto edition (Paris, 1701.), which henceforward I shall quote.

[3] Julian states three different proportions, of 5, 10, or 15 *modii* of wheat, for one piece of gold, according to the degrees of plenty and scarcity (in Misop. p. 369.). From this fact, and from some collateral examples, I conclude, that under the successors of Constantine, the moderate price of wheat was about 32 shillings the English quarter, which is equal to the average price of the 64 first years of the present century. Arbuthnot's Tables of Coins, Weights, and Measures, p. 88. Plin. Hist. Nat. xviii. 12. Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. xxviii. 718. Smith's Wealth of Nations, i. 246. *This last I am proud to quote, as the work of a sage and a friend.*

supply of wine, oil, and bread; but he acknowledged that it was the duty of a sovereign to provide for the subsistence of his people. With this salutary view, the emperor ventured on a very dangerous and doubtful step, of fixing, by legal authority, the value of corn. He enacted, that, in a time of scarcity, it should be sold at a price which had seldom been known in the most plentiful years; and that his own example might strengthen his laws, he sent into the market 422,000 *modii*, or measures, which were drawn, by his order, from the granaries of Hierapolis, of Chalcis, and even of Egypt. The consequences might have been foreseen, and were soon felt. The Imperial wheat was purchased by the rich merchants; the proprietors of land, or of corn, withheld from the city the accustomed supply; and the small quantities that appeared in the market, were secretly sold at an advanced and illegal price. Julian still continued to applaud his own policy, treated the complaints of the people as a vain and ungrateful murmur, and convinced Antioch, that he had inherited the obstinacy, though not the cruelty, of his brother Gallus.[1] The remonstrances of the municipal senate served only to exasperate his inflexible mind. He was persuaded, perhaps with truth, that the senators of Antioch who possessed lands, or were concerned in trade, had themselves contributed to the calamities of their country; and he imputed the disrespectful boldness which they assumed, to the sense, not of public duty, but of private interest. The whole body, consisting of two hundred of the most noble and wealthy citizens, were sent, under a guard, from the palace to the prison; and though they were permitted, before the close of evening, to return to their respective houses,[2] the emperor himself could not obtain the forgiveness which he had so easily granted. The same grievances were still the subject of the same complaints, which were industriously circulated by the wit and levity of the Syrian Greeks. During the licentious days of the Saturnalia, the streets of the city resounded with insolent songs, which derided the laws, the religion, the personal conduct, and even the *beard* of the emperor; and the spirit of Antioch was manifested by the connivance of the magistrates, and the applause of the multitude.[3] The disciple of Socrates was too deeply affected by these popular insults; but the monarch, endowed with quick sensibility, and possessed of absolute power, refused his passions the gratification of revenge. A tyrant might have proscribed, without distinction, the lives and fortunes of the citizens of Antioch; and the unwarlike Syrians must have patiently submitted to the lust, the rapaciousness, and the cruelty, of the faithful legions of Gaul. A milder sentence might have deprived the capital of the East of its honours and privileges; and the courtiers, perhaps the subjects, of Julian, would have applauded an act of justice,

[1] Nunquam a proposito declinabat, Galli similis fratris, licet incruentus. Ammian. xxii. 14. The ignorance of the most enlightened princes may claim some excuse; but we cannot be satisfied with Julian's own defence (Misop. p. 368.), or the elaborate apology of Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. xcvii. 321.).

[2] Their short and easy confinement is gently touched by Libanius (Orat. Parent. c. xcviii. 322.).

[3] Liban. (ad Antiochen. de Imperat. ira, c. 17, 18, 19. in Fabric. Biblio. Græc. vii. 221.), like a skilful advocate, severely censures the folly of the people, who suffered for the crime of a few obscure and drunken wretches.

which asserted the dignity of the supreme magistrate of the republic.[1] But instead of abusing, or exerting, the authority of the state, to revenge his personal injuries, Julian contented himself with an inoffensive mode of retaliation, which it would be in the power of few princes to employ. He had been insulted by satires and libels; in his turn he composed, under the title of the *Enemy of the Beard*, an ironical confession of his own faults, and a severe satire of the licentious and effeminate manners of Antioch. This Imperial reply was publicly exposed before the gates of the palace; and the MISOPOGON[2] still remains a singular monument of the resentment, the wit, the humanity, and the indiscretion of Julian. Though he affected to laugh, he could not forgive.[3] His contempt was expressed, and his revenge might be gratified, by the nomination of a governor[4] worthy only of such subjects: and the emperor, for ever renouncing the ungrateful city, proclaimed his resolution to pass the ensuing winter at Tarsus in Cilicia.[5]

Yet Antioch possessed one citizen, whose genius and virtues might atone, in the opinion of Julian, for the vice and folly of his country. The sophist Libanius (A.D. 314—390, &c.) was born in the capital of the East; he publicly professed the arts of rhetoric and declamation at Nice, Nicomedia, Constantinople, Athens, and, during the remainder of his life, at Antioch. His school was assiduously frequented by the Grecian youth; his disciples, who sometimes exceeded the number of eighty, celebrated their incomparable master; and the jealousy of his rivals, who persecuted him from one city to another, confirmed the favourable opinion which Libanius ostentatiously displayed of his superior merit. The præceptors of Julian had extorted a rash but solemn assurance, that he would never attend the lectures of their adversary: the curiosity of the royal youth was checked and inflamed: he secretly procured the writings of this dangerous sophist, and gradually surpassed, in the perfect imitation of his style, the most laborious of his domestic pupils.—*Liban. Orat. Paren.* c. vii. 230. When Julian ascended the throne, he declared his impatience to embrace and reward the Syrian sophist, who had preserved, in a degenerate age, the Grecian purity of taste, of manners, and of religion. The emperor's prepossession was increased and justified by the discreet pride of his favourite. Instead of pressing, with the foremost of the crowd, into the palace of Constantinople, Libanius calmly expected his arrival at Antioch; withdrew from court on the first

[1] Liban. (ad. Antiochen. c. vii. [p. 213.) reminds Antioch of the recent chastisement of Cæsarea: and even Julian (Misop. p. 355.) insinuates how severely Tarentum had expiated the insult to the Roman ambassadors.

[2] On the subject of the Misopogon, see Ammian. (xxii. 14.), Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. xcix. 323.), Greg. Naz. (Orat. iv. 133.), Chron. of Antioch, by John Malela (ii. 15, 16.). I have essential obligations to the translation and notes of La Bleterie (Vie de Jov. ii. 1—138.).

[3] Ammianus very justly remarks, Coactus dissimulare pro tempore irâ sufflabatur internâ. The elaborate irony of Julian at length bursts forth into serious and direct invective.

[4] Ipse autem Antiochiam egressurus, Heliopoliten quendam Alexandrum Syriacæ jurisdictioni præfecit, turbulentum et sævum; dicebatque non illum meruisse, sed Antiochensibus avaris et contumeliosis hujusmodi judicem convenire. Ammian. xxiii. 2. Liban. (Epist. 722. p. 346.), who confesses to Julian himself, that he had shared the general discontent, pretends that Alexander was an useful, though harsh, reformer of the manners and religion of Antioch.

[5] Julian, in Misop. p. 364. Ammian. xxiii. 2. and Valesius ad loc. Libanius, in a professed oration, invites him to return to his loyal and penitent city of Antioch.

symptoms of coldness and indifference; required a formal invitation for each visit; and taught his sovereign an important lesson, that he might command the obedience of a subject, but that he must deserve the attachment of a friend. The sophists of every age, despising, or affecting to despise, the accidental distinctions of birth and fortune,[1] reserve their esteem for the superior qualities of the mind, with which they themselves are so plentifully endowed. Julian might disdain the acclamations of a venal court, who adored the Imperial purple; but he was deeply flattered by the praise, the admonition, the freedom, and the envy of an independent philosopher, who refused his favours, loved his person, celebrated his fame, and protected his memory. The voluminous writings of Libanius still exist; for the most part they are the vain and idle compositions of an orator, who cultivated the science of words; the productions of a recluse student, whose mind, regardless of his contemporaries, was incessantly fixed on the Trojan war, and the Athenian commonwealth. Yet the sophist of Antioch sometimes descended from this imaginary elevation; he entertained a various and elaborate correspondence;[2] he praised the virtues of his own times; he boldly arraigned the abuses of public and private life; and he eloquently pleaded the cause of Antioch against the just resentment of Julian and Theodosius. It is the common calamity of old age,[3] to lose whatever might have rendered it desirable; but Libanius experienced the peculiar misfortune of surviving the religion and the sciences, to which he had consecrated his genius. The friend of Julian was an indignant spectator of the triumph of Christianity; and his bigotry, which darkened the prospect of the visible world, did not inspire Libanius with any lively hopes of celestial glory and happiness.[4]

The martial impatience of Julian urged him to take the field in the beginning of the spring; and he dismissed (A.D. 363. Mar. 5), with contempt and reproach, the senate of Antioch, who accompanied the emperor beyond the limits of their own territory, to which he was resolved never to return. After a laborious march of two days,[5] he halted on the third at Beræa, or Aleppo, where he had the mortification of finding a senate almost entirely Christian; who received with cold and formal demonstrations of respect, the eloquent sermon of the apostle of paganism. The son of one of the most illustrious citizens

[1] Eunapius reports, that Libanius refused the honorary rank of Prætorian præfect, as less illustrious than the title of Sophist (in Vit. Sophist. p. 135.). The critics have observed a similar sentiment in one of the epistles (xviii. ed. Wolf.) of Libanius himself.

[2] Near 2000 of his letters, a mode of composition in which Libanius was thought to excel, are still extant, and already published. The critics may praise their subtle and elegant brevity; yet Bentley (Dissert. upon Phalaris, p. 487.) might justly, though quaintly, observe, that "you feel by the emptiness and deadness of them, that you converse with some dreaming "pedant, with his elbow on his desk."

[3] His birth is assigned to the year 314. He mentions the 76th year of his age (A.D. 390.), and seems to allude to some events of a still later date.

[4] Libanius has composed the vain, prolix, but curious narrative of his own life (ii. 1—84. ed. Morell.), of which Eunap. (p. 130.) has left a concise and unfavourable account. Among the moderns, Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. iv. 571.), Fabric. (Biblio. Græc. vii. 378.), and Lardner (Heath. Test. iv. 127.), have illustrated the character and writings of this famous sophist.

[5] From Antioch to Litarbe, on the territory of Chalcis, the road, over hills and through morasses, was extremely bad; and the loose stones were cemented only with sand (Julian. epist. xxvii.). It is singular enough, that the Romans should have neglected the great communication between Antioch and the Euphrates. Wessel. Itin. p. 190. Bergier, Hist. des Grands Chemins, ii. 100.

of Beræa, who had embraced, either from interest or conscience, the religion of the emperor, was disinherited by his angry parent. The father and the son were invited to the Imperial table. Julian, placing himself between them, attempted, without success, to inculcate the lesson and example of toleration; supported, with affected calmness, the indiscreet zeal of the aged Christian, who seemed to forget the sentiments of nature, and the duty of a subject; and at length turning towards the afflicted youth, "Since you have lost a father," said he, "for my sake, it is incumbent on me to supply his place."[1] The emperor was received in a manner much more agreeable to his wishes at Batnæ, a small town pleasantly seated in a grove of cypresses, about 20 miles from the city of Hierapolis. The solemn rites of sacrifice were decently prepared by the inhabitants of Batnæ, who seemed attached to the worship of their tutelar deities, Apollo and Jupiter; but the serious piety of Julian was offended by the tumult of their applause; and he too clearly discerned, that the smoke which arose from their altars was the incense of flattery, rather than of devotion. The ancient and magnificent temple, which had sanctified, for so many ages, the city of Hierapolis,[2] no longer subsisted; and the consecrated wealth, which afforded a liberal maintenance to more than 300 priests, might hasten its downfall. Yet Julian enjoyed the satisfaction of embracing a philosopher and a friend, whose religious firmness had withstood the pressing and repeated solicitations of Constantius and Gallus, as often as those princes lodged at his house, in their passage through Hierapolis. In the hurry of military preparation, and the careless confidence of a familiar correspondence, the zeal of Julian appears to have been lively and uniform. He had now undertaken an important and difficult war; and the anxiety of the event rendered him still more attentive to observe and register the most trifling presages, from which, according to the rules of divination, any knowledge of futurity could be derived.[3] He informed Libanius of his progress as far as Hierapolis, by an elegant epistle (*Julian*, *Epist.* xxvii. 399), which displays the facility of his genius, and his tender friendship for the sophist of Antioch.

Hierapolis, situate almost on the banks of the Euphrates,[4] had been appointed for the general rendezvous of the Roman troops, who immediately passed the great river on a bridge of boats, which was previously constructed.[5] If the inclinations of Julian had been similar to those of his predecessor, he might have wasted the active and important season of the year in the circus of Samosata, or in the churches

[1] Julian alludes to this incident (epist. xxvii.), which is more distinctly related by Theodor. (l. iii. c. 22.). The intolerant spirit of the father is applauded by Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. iv. 534.), and even by La Bleterie (Vie de Julien, p. 413.).

[2] Treatise de Deâ Syriâ, inserted among the works of Lucian (iii. 451. edit. Reitz.). The singular appellation of *Ninus vetus* (Ammian. xiv. 8.) might induce a suspicion, that Hierapolis had been the royal seat of the Assyrians.

[3] Julian (epist. xxviii.) kept a regular account of all the fortunate omens; but he suppresses the inauspicious signs, which Ammian. (xxiii. 2.) has carefully recorded.

[4] I take the earliest opportunity of acknowledging my obligations to M. d'Anville, for his recent geography of the Euphrates and Tigris (Paris, 1780, 4to.), which particularly illustrates the expedition of Julian.

[5] There are three passages within a few miles of each other; 1. Zeugma, celebrated by the ancients; 2. Bir, frequented by the moderns; and, 3. The bridge of Menbigz, or Hierapolis, at the distance of four parasangs from the city.

of Edessa. But as the warlike emperor, instead of Constantius, had chosen Alexander for his model, he advanced without delay to Carrhæ,[1] a very ancient city of Mesopotamia, at the distance of 80 miles from Hierapolis. The temple of the Moon attracted the devotion of Julian: but the halt of a few days was principally employed in completing the immense preparations of the Persian war. The secret of the expedition had hitherto remained in his own breast; but as Carrhæ is the point of separation of the two great roads, he could no longer conceal, whether it was his design to attack the dominions of Sapor on the side of the Tigris, or on that of the Euphrates. The emperor detached an army of 30,000 men, under the command of his kinsman Procopius, and of Sebastian, who had been duke of Egypt. They were ordered to direct their march towards Nisibis, and to secure the frontier from the desultory incursions of the enemy, before they attempted the passage of the Tigris. Their subsequent operations were left to the discretion of the generals; but Julian expected, that after wasting with fire and sword the fertile districts of Media and Adiabene, they might arrive under the walls of Ctesiphon about the same time that he himself, advancing with equal steps along the banks of the Euphrates, should besiege the capital of the Persian monarchy. The success of this well-concerted plan depended, in a great measure, on the powerful and ready assistance of the king of Armenia, who, without exposing the safety of his own dominions, might detach an army of 4000 horse, and 20,000 foot, to the assistance of the Romans.[2] But the feeble Arsaces Tiranus,[3] king of Armenia, had degenerated still more shamefully than his father Chosroes, from the manly virtues of the great Tiridates; and as the pusillanimous monarch was averse to any enterprise of danger and glory, he could disguise his timid indolence by the more decent excuses of religion and gratitude. He expressed a pious attachment to the memory of Constantius, from whose hands he had received in marriage Olympias, the daughter of the præfect Ablavius; and the alliance of a female, who had been educated as the destined wife of the emperor Constans, exalted the dignity of a Barbarian king.[4] Tiranus professed the Christian religion; he reigned over a nation of Christians; and he was restrained, by every principle of conscience and interest, from contributing to the victory, which would consummate the ruin of the church. The alienated mind of Tiranus was exasperated by the indiscretion of Julian, who treated the king of Armenia as *his* slave, and as the enemy of the gods. The haughty and threatening style of the Imperial mandates[5]

[1] Haran, or Carrhæ, was the ancient residence of the Sabæans, and of Abraham. Index Geog. of Schultens (ad calcem Vit. Saladin.), a work from which I have obtained much *Oriental* knowledge, concerning the ancient and modern geography of Syria and the adjacent countries.

[2] Xenoph. Cyr. l. iii. 189. ed. Hutch. Artavasdes might have supplied Marc Antony with 16,000 horse, armed and disciplined after the Parthian manner (Plutarch, in M. Antonio, v. 117.).

[3] Moses of Chorene (Hist. Armeniac. l. iii. c. 11. p. 242.) fixes his accession (A.D. 354.) to the 17th year of Constantius.

[4] Ammian. xx. 11. Athanas. (i. 856.) says, in general terms, that Constantius gave his brother's widow τοῖς βαρβάροις, an expression more suitable to a Roman than a Christian.

[5] Ammian. (xxiii. 2.) uses a word much too soft for the occasion, *monuerat*. Muratori (Fabric. Bib. Græc. vii. 86.) has published an epistle from Julian to the satrap Arsaces; fierce, vulgar, and (though it might deceive Soz. l. vi. c. 5.) most probably spurious. La Bleterie (Hist. de Jov. ii. 339.) translates and rejects it.

awakened the secret indignation of a prince, who, in the humiliating state of dependence, was still conscious of his royal descent from the Arsacides, the lords of the East, and the rivals of the Roman power.

The military dispositions of Julian were skilfully contrived to deceive the spies, and to divert the attention, of Sapor. The legions appeared to direct their march towards Nisibis and the Tigris. On a sudden they wheeled to the right; traversed the level and naked plain of Carrhæ; and reached, on the third day, the banks of the Euphrates, where the strong town of Nicephorium, or Callinicum, had been founded by the Macedonian kings. From thence the emperor pursued his march, above 90 miles, along the winding stream of the Euphrates, till, at length, about one month after his departure from Antioch, he discovered the towers of Circesium, the extreme limit of the Roman dominions. The army of Julian, the most numerous that any of the Cæsars had ever led against Persia, consisted of 65,000 effective and well-disciplined soldiers. The veteran bands of cavalry and infantry, of Romans and Barbarians, had been selected from the different provinces; and a just pre-eminence of loyalty and valour was claimed by the hardy Gauls, who guarded the throne and person of their beloved prince. A formidable body of Scythian auxiliaries had been transported from another climate, and almost from another world, to invade a distant country, of whose name and situation they were ignorant. The love of rapine and war allured to the Imperial standard several tribes of Saracens, or roving Arabs, whose service Julian had commanded, while he sternly refused the payment of the accustomed subsidies. The broad channel of the Euphrates[1] was crowded by a fleet of 1100 ships, destined to attend the motions, and to satisfy the wants, of the Roman army. The military strength of the fleet was composed of 50 armed gallies; and these were accompanied by an equal number of flat-bottomed boats, which might occasionally be connected into the form of temporary bridges. The rest of the ships, partly constructed of timber, and partly covered with raw hides, were laden with an almost inexhaustible supply of arms and engines, of utensils and provisions. The vigilant humanity of Julian had embarked a very large magazine of vinegar and biscuit for the use of the soldiers, but he prohibited the indulgence of wine; and rigorously stopped a long string of superfluous camels that attempted to follow the rear of the army. The river Chaboras falls into the Euphrates at Circesium;[2] and as soon as the trumpet gave the signal of march, the Romans (April 7th) passed the little stream which separated two mighty and hostile empires. The custom of ancient discipline required a military oration; and Julian embraced every opportunity of displaying his eloquence. He animated the impatient and attentive

[1] Latissimum flumen Euphraten artabat. Ammian. xxiii. 3. Somewhat higher, at the fords of Thapsacus, the river is 4 stadia, or 800 yards, almost half an English mile, broad (Xenoph. Anab. l. i. p. 41. ed. Hutch. with Foster's Observations, p. 29. vol. ii. Spelman's translation). If the breadth of the Euphrates at Bir and Zeugma is no more than 130 yards (Voyages de Niebuhr, ii. 335.), the enormous difference must chiefly arise from the depth of the channel.

[2] Monumentum tutissimum et fabrè politum, cujus mœnia Abora (the Orientals aspire Chaboras or Chabour) et Euphrates ambiunt flumina, velut spatium insulare fingentes. Ammian. xxiii. 5.

legions by the example of the inflexible courage and glorious triumphs of their ancestors. He excited their resentment by a lively picture of the insolence of the Persians; and he exhorted them to imitate his firm resolution, either to extirpate that perfidious nation, or to devote his life in the cause of the republic. The eloquence of Julian was enforced by a donative of 130 pieces of silver to every soldier; and the bridge of the Chaboras was instantly cut away, to convince the troops that they must place their hopes of safety in the success of their arms. Yet the prudence of the emperor induced him to secure a remote frontier, perpetually exposed to the inroads of the hostile Arabs. A detachment of 4000 men was left at Circesium, which completed, to the number of 10,000, the regular garrison of that important fortress.[1]

From the moment that the Romans entered the enemy's country,[2] the country of an active and artful enemy, the order of march was disposed in three columns.[3] The strength of the infantry, and consequently of the whole army, was placed in the centre, under the peculiar command of their master-general Victor. On the right, the brave Nevitta led a column of several legions along the banks of the Euphrates, and almost always in sight of the fleet. The left flank of the army was protected by the column of cavalry. Hormisdas and Arinthæus were appointed generals of the horse; and the singular adventures of Hormisdas[4] are not undeserving of our notice. He was a Persian prince, of the royal race of the Sassanides, who, in the troubles of the minority of Sapor, had escaped from prison to the hospitable court of the great Constantine. Hormisdas, at first, excited the compassion, and, at length, acquired the esteem, of his new masters; his valour and fidelity raised him to the military honours of the Roman service; and, though a Christian, he might indulge the secret satisfaction of convincing his ungrateful country, that an oppressed subject may prove the most dangerous enemy. Such was the disposition of the three principal columns. The front and flanks of the army were covered by Lucillianus with a flying detachment of 1500 light-armed soldiers, whose active vigilance observed the most distant signs, and conveyed the earliest notice of any hostile approach. Dagalaiphus, and Secundinus duke of Osrhoene, conducted the troops of the rear-guard; the baggage, securely, proceeded in the intervals of the columns; and the ranks, from a motive either of use or ostentation, were formed in such open order, that the whole line of march extended almost ten miles. The ordinary post of Julian was at the head of the centre column; but as he preferred the duties of a general to the state of a monarch, he rapidly moved, with a small escort of light cavalry, to the front,

[1] The enterprize and armament of Julian are described by himself (Epist. xxvii.), Ammian. (xxiii. 3, 4, 5.), Liban. (Orat. Paren. c. 108, 109. p. 332.), Zos. (l. iii. 160.), Soz. (l. vi. c. 1.), and John Malela (ii. 17.).

[2] Before he enters Persia, Ammianus copiously describes (xxiii. 6. p. 396. ed. Gronov. 4to.) the 18 great satrapies, or provinces (as far as the Seric, or Chinese frontiers), which were subject to the Sassanides.

[3] Ammian. (xxiv. 1.) and Zos. (l. iii. p. 162, 163.) have accurately expressed the order of march.

[4] The adventures of Hormisdas are related with some mixture of fable (Zos. l. ii. 100; Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. iv. 198.). It is almost impossible that he should be the brother (frater germanus) of an *eldest* and *posthumous* child: nor do I recollect that Ammianus ever gives him that title.

the rear, the flanks, wherever his presence could animate or protect the march of the Roman army. The country which they traversed from the Chaboras, to the cultivated lands of Assyria, may be considered as a part of the desert of Arabia, a dry and barren waste, which could never be improved by the most powerful arts of human industry. Julian marched over the same ground which had been trod above seven hundred years before by the footsteps of the younger Cyrus, and which is described by one of the companions of his expedition, the sage and heroic Xenophon.[1] "The country was a plain "throughout, as even as the sea, and full of wormwood; and if any "other kind of shrubs or reeds grew there, they had all an aromatic "smell; but no trees could be seen. Bustards and ostriches, ante- "lopes and wild asses,[2] appeared to be the only inhabitants of the "desert; and the fatigues of the march were alleviated by the amuse- "ments of the chace." The loose sand of the desert was frequently raised by the wind into clouds of dust: and a great number of the soldiers of Julian, with their tents, were suddenly thrown to the ground by the violence of an unexpected hurricane.

The sandy plains of Mesopotamia were abandoned to the antelopes and wild asses of the desert; but a variety of populous towns and villages were pleasantly situated on the banks of the Euphrates, and in the islands which are occasionally formed by that river. The city of Annah, or Anatho,[3] the actual residence of an Arabian Emir, is composed of two long streets, which inclose, within a natural fortification, a small island in the midst, and two fruitful spots on either side, of the Euphrates. The warlike inhabitants of Anatho showed a disposition to stop the march of a Roman emperor; till they were diverted from such fatal presumption by the mild exhortations of prince Hormisdas, and the approaching terrors of the fleet and army. They implored, and experienced, the clemency of Julian; who transplanted the people to an advantageous settlement, near Chalcis in Syria, and admitted Pusæus, the governor, to an honourable rank in his service and friendship. But the impregnable fortress of Thilutha could scorn the menace of a siege; and the emperor was obliged to content himself with an insulting promise, that when he had subdued the interior provinces of Persia, Thilutha would no longer refuse to grace the triumph of the conqueror. The inhabitants of the open towns, unable to resist, and unwilling to yield, fled with precipitation; and their houses, filled with spoil and provisions, were occupied by the soldiers of Julian, who massacred, without remorse, and without punishment, some defenceless women. During the march, the Surenas, or Persian general, and Malek Rodosaces, the renowned Emir

[1] First book of the Anabasis, p. 45. This pleasing work is original and authentic. Yet Xenophon's memory, perhaps many years after the expedition, has sometimes betrayed him; and the distances which he marks are often larger than either a soldier or a geographer will allow.

[2] Spelman, the English translator of the Anabasis (i. 51.), confounds the antelope with the roe-buck, and the wild ass with the zebra.

[3] Voyag. de Tavernier, part i. l. iii. 316. and more especially Viaggi di Pietro della Valle, i. lett. xvii. 671. He was ignorant of the old name and condition of Annah. Our blind travellers *seldom* possess any previous knowledge of the countries which they visit. Shaw and Tournefort deserve an honourable exception.

of the tribe of Gassan,[1] incessantly hovered round the army: every straggler was intercepted; every detachment was attacked; and the valiant Hormisdas escaped with some difficulty from their hands. But the Barbarians were finally repulsed; the country became every day less favourable to the operations of cavalry; and when the Romans arrived at Macepracta, they perceived the ruins of the wall, which had been constructed by the ancient kings of Assyria, to secure their dominions from the incursions of the Medes. These preliminaries of the expedition of Julian appear to have employed about 15 days; and we may compute near 300 miles from the fortress of Circesium to the wall of Macepracta.[2]

The fertile province of Assyria,[3] which stretched beyond the Tigris, as far as the mountains of Media,[4] extended about 400 miles from the ancient wall of Macepracta to the territory of Basra, where the united streams of the Euphrates and Tigris discharge themselves into the Persian Gulf.[5] The whole country might have claimed the peculiar name of Mesopotamia; as the two rivers, which are never more distant than 50, approach, between Bagdad and Babylon, within 25 miles of each other. A multitude of artificial canals, dug without much labour in a soft and yielding soil, connected the rivers, and intersected the plain, of Assyria. The uses of these artificial canals were various and important. They served to discharge the superfluous waters from one river into the other, at the season of their respective inundations. Subdividing themselves into smaller and smaller branches, they refreshed the dry lands, and supplied the deficiency of rain. They facilitated the intercourse of peace and commerce; and, as the dams could be speedily broke down, they armed the despair of the Assyrians with the means of opposing a sudden deluge to the progress of an invading army. To the soil and climate of Assyria, nature had denied some of her choicest gifts, the vine, the olive, and the fig-tree; but the food which supports the life of man, and particularly wheat and barley, were produced with inexhaustible fertility: and the husbandman, who committed his seed to the earth, was frequently rewarded with an increase of two, or even of three, hundred. The face of the country was interspersed with groves of in-

[1] Famosi nominis latro, says Ammianus; an high encomium for an Arab. The tribe of Gassan had settled on the edge of Syria, and reigned some time in Damascus, under a dynasty of 31 kings, or emirs, from the time of Pompey to that of the Khalif Omar. D'Herbelot, Bib. Orient. p. 360. Pocock, Specimen Hist. Arabicæ, p. 75. The name of Rodosaces does not appear in the list.

[2] Ammian. (xxiv. 1, 2.), Liban. (Orat. Paren. c. 110, 111. p. 334.), Zos. (l. iii. 164.).

[3] The description of Assyria is furnished by Herodotus (l. i. c. 192.), who sometimes writes for children, and sometimes for philosophers; by Strabo (l. xvi. 1070.), and by Ammian. (l. xxiii. c. 6.). The most useful of the modern travellers are Tavernier (part i. l. ii. 226.), Otter (ii. 35. and 189.), and Niebuhr (ii. 172.). Yet I much regret that the *Irak Arabi* of Abulfeda has not been translated.

[4] Ammianus remarks, that the primitive Assyria, which comprehended Ninus (Nineveh) and Arbela, had assumed the more recent and peculiar appellation of Adiabene: and he seems to fix Teredon, Vologesia, and Apollonia, as the *extreme* cities of the actual province of Assyria.

[5] The two rivers unite at Apamea, or Corna (100 miles from the Persian Gulf), into the broad stream of the Pasitigris, or Shat-ul-Arab. The Euphrates formerly reached the sea by a separate channel, which was obstructed and diverted by the citizens of Orchoe, about 20 m. S.E. of modern Basra (d'Anville, Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. xxx. 170.).

numerable palm-trees;[1] and the diligent natives celebrated, either in verse or prose, the three hundred and sixty uses to which the trunk, the branches, the leaves, the juice, and the fruit, were skilfully applied. Several manufactures, especially those of leather and linen, employed the industry of a numerous people, and afforded valuable materials for foreign trade; which appears, however, to have been conducted by the hands of strangers. Babylon had been converted into a royal park; but near the ruins of the ancient capital, new cities had successively arisen, and the populousness of the country was displayed in the multitude of towns and villages, which were built of bricks dried in the sun, and strongly cemented with bitumen; the natural and peculiar production of the Babylonian soil. While the successors of Cyrus reigned over Asia, the province of Assyria alone maintained, during a third part of the year, the luxurious plenty of the table and household of the Great King. Four considerable villages were assigned for the subsistence of his Indian dogs; 800 stallions, and 16,000 mares, were constantly kept, at the expence of the country, for the royal stables; and as the daily tribute, which was paid to the satrap, amounted to one English bushel of silver, we may compute the annual revenue of Assyria at more than £1,200,000.[2]

The fields of Assyria were (A.D. 363. May) devoted by Julian to the calamities of war; and the philosopher retaliated on a guiltless people the acts of rapine and cruelty, which had been committed by their haughty master in the Roman provinces. The trembling Assyrians summoned the rivers to their assistance; and completed, with their own hands, the ruin of their country. The roads were rendered impracticable; a flood of waters was poured into the camp; and, during several days, the troops of Julian were obliged to contend with the most discouraging hardships. But every obstacle was surmounted by the perseverance of the legionaries, who were inured to toil as well as to danger, and who felt themselves animated by the spirit of their leader. The damage was gradually repaired; the waters were restored to their proper channels; whole groves of palm-trees were cut down, and placed along the broken parts of the road; and the army passed over the broad and deeper canals, on bridges of floating rafts, which were supported by the help of bladders. Two cities of Assyria presumed to resist the arms of a Roman emperor: and they both paid the severe penalty of their rashness. At the distance of 50 miles from the royal residence of Ctesiphon, Perisabor, or Anbar, held the second rank in the province: a city, large, populous, and well fortified, surrounded with a double wall, almost encompassed by a branch of the Euphrates, and defended by the valour of a numerous garrison. The exhortations of Hormisdas were repulsed with contempt; and the ears

[1] The learned Kæmpfer, as a botanist, an antiquary, and a traveller, has exhausted (Amœnitat. Exoticæ, Fascicul. iv. 660.) the whole subject of palm-trees.

[2] Assyria yielded to the Persian satrap, an *Artaba* of silver each day. The well-known proportion of weights and measures (Bishop Hooper's Inquiry), the specific gravity of water and silver, and the value of that metal, will afford, after a short process, the annual revenue which I have stated. Yet the Great King received no more than 1000 Euboic, or Tyrian. talents (£252,000) from Assyria. The comparison of two passages in Herodotus (l. i. c. 192. l. iii. c. 89—96.) reveals an important difference between the *gross*, and the *net*, revenue of Persia; the sums paid by the province, and the gold or silver deposited in the royal treasure. The monarch might annually save £3,600,000 of the 17 or 18 millions raised upon the people.

of the Persian prince were wounded by a just reproach, that, unmindful of his royal birth, he conducted an army of strangers against his king and country. The Assyrians maintained their loyalty by a skilful, as well as vigorous, defence ; till the lucky stroke of a battering-ram, having opened a large breach, by shattering one of the angles of the wall, they hastily retired into the fortifications of the interior citadel. The soldiers of Julian rushed impetuously into the town, and, after the full gratification of every military appetite, Perisabor was reduced to ashes ; and the engines which assaulted the citadel were planted on the ruins of the smoking houses. The contest was continued by an incessant and mutual discharge of missile weapons ; and the superiority which the Romans might derive from the mechanical powers of their balistæ and catapultæ was counterbalanced by the advantage of the ground on the side of the besieged. But as soon as an *Helepolis* had been constructed, which could engage on equal terms with the loftiest ramparts, the tremendous aspect of a moving turret, that would leave no hope of resistance or of mercy, terrified the defenders of the citadel into an humble submission ; and the place was surrendered only two days after Julian first appeared under the walls of Perisabor. Two thousand five hundred persons, of both sexes, the feeble remnant of a flourishing people, were permitted to retire : the plentiful magazines of corn, of arms, and of splendid furniture, were partly distributed among the troops, and partly reserved for the public service : the useless stores were destroyed by fire, or thrown into the stream of the Euphrates ; and the fate of Amida was revenged by the total ruin of Perisabor.

The city, or rather fortress, of Maogamalcha, which was defended by sixteen large towers, a deep ditch, and two strong and solid walls of brick and bitumen, appears to have been constructed at the distance of 11 miles, as the safeguard of the capital of Persia. The emperor, apprehensive of leaving such an important fortress in his rear, immediately formed the siege of Maogamalcha; and the Roman army was distributed, for that purpose, into three divisions. Victor, at the head of the cavalry, and of a detachment of heavy-armed foot, was ordered to clear the country, as far as the banks of the Tigris and the suburbs of Ctesiphon. The conduct of the attack was assumed by Julian himself, who seemed to place his whole dependence in the military engines which he erected against the walls ; while he secretly contrived a more efficacious method of introducing his troops into the heart of the city. Under the direction of Nevitta and Dagalaiphus, the trenches were opened at a considerable distance, and gradually prolonged as far as the edge of the ditch. The ditch was speedily filled with earth ; and, by the incessant labour of the troops, a mine was carried under the foundations of the walls, and sustained, at sufficient intervals, by props of timber. Three chosen cohorts, advancing in a single file, silently explored the dark and dangerous passage ; till their intrepid leader whispered back the intelligence, that he was ready to issue from his confinement into the streets of the hostile city. Julian checked their ardour, that he might ensure their success ; and immediately diverted the attention of the garrison, by the tumult and clamour of a general assault. The Persians, who, from their walls, contemptuously beheld

the progress of an impotent attack, celebrated, with songs of triumph, the glory of Sapor; and ventured to assure the emperor, that he might ascend the starry mansion of Ormusd, before he could hope to take the impregnable city of Maogamalcha. The city was already taken. History has recorded the name of a private soldier, the first who ascended from the mine into a deserted tower. The passage was widened by his companions, who pressed forwards with impatient valour. Fifteen hundred enemies were already in the midst of the city. The astonished garrison abandoned the walls, and their only hope of safety; the gates were instantly burst open: and the revenge of the soldier, unless it were suspended by lust or avarice, was satiated by an undistinguishing massacre. The governor, who had yielded on a promise of mercy, was burnt alive, a few days afterwards, on a charge of having uttered some disrespectful words against the honour of prince Hormisdas. The fortifications were razed to the ground; and not a vestige was left, that the city of Maogamalcha had ever existed. The neighbourhood of the capital of Persia was adorned with three stately palaces, laboriously enriched with every production that could gratify the luxury and pride of an Eastern monarch. The pleasant situation of the gardens along the banks of the Tigris, was improved, according to the Persian taste, by the symmetry of flowers, fountains, and shady walks: and spacious parks were inclosed for the reception of the bears, lions, and wild boars, which were maintained at a considerable expence for the pleasure of the royal chace. The park-walls were broke down, the savage game was abandoned to the darts of the soldiers, and the palaces of Sapor were reduced to ashes, by the command of the Roman emperor. Julian, on this occasion, showed himself ignorant, or careless, of the laws of civility, which the prudence and refinement of polished ages have established between hostile princes. Yet these wanton ravages need not excite in our breasts any vehement emotions of pity or resentment. A simple, naked statue, finished by the hand of a Grecian artist, is of more genuine value than all these rude and costly monuments of Barbaric labour: and, if we are more deeply affected by the ruin of a palace, than by the conflagration of a cottage, our humanity must have formed a very erroneous estimate of the miseries of human life.[1]

Julian was an object of terror and hatred to the Persians: and the painters of that nation represented the invader of their country under the emblem of a furious lion, who vomited from his mouth a consuming fire.—*Liban. de ulciscendâ Juliani nece*, c. 13. p. 162. To his friends and soldiers, the philosophic hero appeared in a more amiable light; and his virtues were never more conspicuously displayed, than in the last, and most active, period of his life. He practised, without effort, and almost without merit, the habitual qualities of temperance and sobriety. According to the dictates of that artificial wisdom, which assumes an absolute dominion over the mind and body, he sternly refused himself the indulgence of the most natural appetites.[2]

[1] The operations of the Assyrian war are circumstantially related by Ammian. (xxiv. 2, 3, 4, 5.), Labin. (Orat. Paren. c. 112. p. 335.), Zos. (l. iii. 168.), and Greg. Naz. (Orat. iv. 113.). The *military* criticisms of the saint are devoutly copied by Tillemont, his faithful slave.

[2] The famous examples of Cyrus, Alexander, and Scipio, were acts of justice.

In the warm climate of Assyria, which solicited a luxurious people to the gratification of every sensual desire, a youthful conqueror preserved his chastity pure and inviolate: nor was Julian ever tempted, even by a motive of curiosity, to visit his female captives of exquisite beauty.[1] With the same firmness that he resisted the allurements of love, he sustained the hardships of war. When the Romans marched through the flat and flooded country, their sovereign, on foot, at the head of his legions, shared their fatigues, and animated their diligence. In every useful labour, the hand of Julian was prompt and strenuous; and the Imperial purple was wet and dirty, as the coarse garment of the meanest soldier. The two sieges allowed him some remarkable opportunities of signalizing his personal valour, which, in the improved state of the military art, can seldom be exerted by a prudent general. The emperor stood before the citadel of Perisabor, insensible of his extreme danger, and encouraged his troops to burst open the gates of iron, till he was almost overwhelmed under a cloud of missile weapons, and huge stones, that were directed against his person. As he examined the exterior fortifications of Maogamalcha, two Persians, devoting themselves for their country, suddenly rushed upon him with drawn scimitars: the emperor dexterously received their blows on his uplifted shield; and, with a steady and well-aimed thrust, laid one of his adversaries dead at his feet. The esteem of a prince who possesses the virtues which he approves, is the noblest recompence of a deserving subject; and the authority which Julian derived from his personal merit, enabled him to revive and enforce the rigour of ancient discipline. He punished with death, or ignominy, the misbehaviour of three troops of horse, who, in a skirmish with the Surenas, had lost their honour, and one of their standards: and he distinguished with *obsidional*[2] crowns the valour of the foremost soldiers, who had ascended into the city of Maogamalcha. After the siege of Perisabor, the firmness of the emperor was exercised by the insolent avarice of the army, who loudly complained, that their services were rewarded by a trifling donative of one hundred pieces of silver. His just indignation was expressed in the grave and manly language of a Roman. "Riches are the object of your desires? those riches are in the hands "of the Persians; and the spoils of this fruitful country are proposed "as the prize of your valour and discipline. Believe me," added Julian, "the Roman republic, which formerly possessed such immense "treasures, is now reduced to want and wretchedness; since our "princes have been persuaded, by weak and interested ministers, to "purchase with gold the tranquillity of the Barbarians. The revenue "is exhausted; the cities are ruined; the provinces are dispeopled. "For myself, the only inheritance that I have received from my royal "ancestors, is a soul incapable of fear; and as long as I am convinced "that every real advantage is seated in the mind, I shall not blush tc

[1] Ex virginibus autem, quæ speciosæ sunt captæ, et in Perside, ubi fœminarum pulchritudo excellit, nec contrectare aliquam voluit nec videre. Ammian. xxiv. 4. The native race of Persians is small and ugly: but it has been improved, by the perpetual mixture of Circassian blood (Herodot. l. iii. c. 97. Buffon, Hist. Nat. iii. 420.).

[2] Obsidionalibus coronis donati. Ammian. xxiv. 4. Either Julian or his historian were unskilful antiquaries. He should have given *mural* crowns. The *obsidional* were the reward of a general who had delivered a besieged city (Aulus Gellius, Noct. Attic. v. 6.).

"acknowledge an honourable poverty, which, in the days of ancient "virtue, was considered as the glory of Fabricius. That glory, and that "virtue, may be your own, if you listen to the voice of Heaven, and of "your leader. But if you will rashly persist, if you are determined to "renew the shameful and mischievous examples of old seditions, pro- "ceed—As it becomes an emperor who has filled the first rank among "men, I am prepared to die, standing; and to despise a precarious "life, which, every hour, may depend on an accidental fever. If I "have been found unworthy of the command, there are now among "you (I speak it with pride and pleasure), there are many chiefs, whose "merit and experience are equal to the conduct of the most important "war. Such has been the temper of my reign, that I can retire, with- "out regret, and without apprehension, to the obscurity of a private "station."[1] The modest resolution of Julian was answered by the unanimous applause and cheerful obedience of the Romans; who declared their confidence of victory, while they fought under the banners of their heroic prince. Their courage was kindled by his frequent and familiar asseverations (for such wishes were the oaths of Julian), "So may I reduce the Persians under the yoke!" "Thus may I re- "store the strength and splendour of the republic!" The love of fame was the ardent passion of his soul: but it was not before he trampled on the ruins of Maogamalcha, that he allowed himself to say, "We have now provided some materials for the sophist of An- "tioch."—*Ammian.* xxiv. 3. *Liban. Orat. Paren.* c. 122. p. 346.

The successful valour of Julian had triumphed over all the obstacles that opposed his march to the gates of Ctesiphon. But the reduction, or even the siege, of the capital of Persia, was still at a distance: nor can the military conduct of the emperor be clearly apprehended, without a knowledge of the country which was the theatre of his bold and skilful operations.[2] Twenty miles to the south of Bagdad, and on the eastern bank of the Tigris, the curiosity of travellers has observed some ruins of the palaces of Ctesiphon, which, in the time of Julian, was a great and populous city. The name and glory of the adjacent Seleucia were for ever extinguished; and the only remaining quarter of that Greek colony had resumed, with the Assyrian language and manners, the primitive appellation of Coche. Coche was situate on the western side of the Tigris; but it was naturally considered as a suburb of Ctesiphon, with which we may suppose it to have been connected by a permanent bridge of boats. The united parts contributed to form the common epithet of Al Modain, THE CITIES, which the Orientals have bestowed on the winter residence of the Sassanides; and the whole circumference of the Persian capital was strongly fortified by the waters of the river, by lofty walls, and by impracticable morasses. Near the ruins of Seleucia, the camp of Julian was fixed; and secured, by a ditch and rampart, against the

[1] I give this speech as original and genuine. Ammianus might hear, could transcribe, and was incapable of inventing, it. I have used some slight freedoms, and conclude with the most forcible sentence.

[2] M. d'Anville (Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. xxviii. 246) has ascertained the true position and distance of Babylon, Seleucia, Ctesiphon, Bagdad, &c. The Roman traveller, Pietro della Valle (i. lett. xvii. 650.), seems to be the most intelligent spectator of that famous province. He is a gentleman and a scholar, but intolerably vain and prolix.

sallies of the numerous and enterprising garrison of Coche. In this fruitful and pleasant country, the Romans were plentifully supplied with water and forage: and several forts, which might have embarrassed the motions of the army, submitted, after some resistance, to the efforts of their valour. The fleet passed from the Euphrates into an artificial derivation of that river, which pours a copious and navigable stream into the Tigris, at a small distance *below* the great city. If they had followed this royal canal, which bore the name of Nahar-Malcha,[1] the intermediate situation of Coche would have separated the fleet and army of Julian; and the rash attempt of steering against the current of the Tigris, and forcing their way through the midst of a hostile capital, must have been attended with the total destruction of the Roman navy. The prudence of the emperor foresaw the danger, and provided the remedy. As he had minutely studied the operations of Trajan in the same country, he soon recollected, that his warlike predecessor had dug a new and navigable canal, which, leaving Coche on the right hand, conveyed the waters of the Nahar-Malcha into the river Tigris, at some distance *above* the cities. From the information of the peasants, Julian ascertained the vestiges of this ancient work, which were almost obliterated by design or accident. By the indefatigable labour of the soldiers, a broad and deep channel was speedily prepared for the reception of the Euphrates. A strong dike was constructed to interrupt the ordinary current of the Nahar-Malcha: a flood of waters rushed impetuously into their new bed; and the Roman fleet, steering their triumphant course into the Tigris, derided the vain and ineffectual barriers which the Persians of Ctesiphon had erected to oppose their passage.

As it became necessary to transport the Roman army over the Tigris, another labour presented itself, of less toil, but of more danger, than the preceding expedition. The stream was broad and rapid; the ascent steep and difficult; and the intrenchments which had been formed on the ridge of the opposite bank, were lined with a numerous army of heavy cuirassiers, dexterous archers, and huge elephants; who (according to the extravagant hyperbole of Libanius) could trample, with the same ease, a field of corn, or a legion of Romans.[2] In the presence of such an enemy, the construction of a bridge was impracticable; and the intrepid prince, who instantly seized the only possible expedient, concealed his design, till the moment of execution, from the knowledge of the Barbarians, of his own troops, and even of his generals themselves. Under the specious pretence of examining the state of the magazines, eighty vessels were gradually unladen; and a select detachment, apparently destined for some secret expedition, was ordered to stand to their arms on the first signal. Julian disguised the silent anxiety of his own mind with smiles of confidence and joy; and amused the hostile nations with the spectacle of military games, which

[1] The royal canal (*Nahar-Malcha*) might be successively restored, altered, divided, &c (Cellarius, Geog. Antiq. ii. 453.): and these changes may serve to explain the seeming contradictions of antiquity. In the time of Julian, it must have fallen into the Euphrates *below* Ctesiphon.

[2] Και μεγεθεσιν ελεφαντων, οις ισον εργον δια σταχυων ελθειν, και φαλαγγες. Rien n'est beau que le vrai; a maxim which should be inscribed on the desk of every rhetorician.

he insultingly celebrated under the walls of Coche. The day was consecrated to pleasure; but, as soon as the hour of supper was past, the emperor summoned the generals to his tent; and acquainted them, that he had fixed that night for the passage of the Tigris. They stood in silent and respectful astonishment; but, when the venerable Sallust assumed the privilege of his age and experience, the rest of the chiefs supported with freedom the weight of his prudent remonstrances.[1] Julian contented himself with observing, that conquest and safety depended on the attempt; that, instead of diminishing, the number of their enemies would be increased, by successive reinforcements; and that a longer delay would neither contract the breadth of the stream, nor level the height of the bank. The signal was instantly given, and obeyed: the most impatient of the legionaries leaped into five vessels that lay nearest to the bank; and, as they plied their oars with intrepid diligence, they were lost, after a few moments, in the darkness of the night. A flame arose on the opposite side; and Julian, who too clearly understood that his foremost vessels, in attempting to land, had been fired by the enemy, dexterously converted their extreme danger into a presage of victory. "Our fellow-soldiers," he eagerly exclaimed, "are already masters of "the bank; see—they make the appointed signal; let us hasten to "emulate and assist their courage." The united and rapid motion of a great fleet broke the violence of the current, and they reached the eastern shore of the Tigris with sufficient speed to extinguish the flames, and rescue their adventurous companions. The difficulties of a steep and lofty ascent were increased by the weight of armour, and the darkness of the night. A shower of stones, darts, and fire, was incessantly discharged on the heads of the assailants; who, after an arduous struggle, climbed the bank, and stood victorious upon the rampart. As soon as they possessed a more equal field, Julian, who, with his light infantry, had led the attack,[2] darted through the ranks a skilful and experienced eye: his bravest soldiers, according to the precepts of Homer,[3] were distributed in the front and rear; and all the trumpets of the Imperial army sounded to battle. The Romans, after sending up a military shout, advanced in measured steps to the animating notes of martial music; launched their formidable javelins; and rushed forwards with drawn swords, to deprive the Barbarians, by a closer onset, of the advantage of their missile weapons. The whole engagement lasted above twelve hours; till the gradual retreat of the Persians was changed into a disorderly flight, of which the shameful example was given by the principal leaders, and the Surenas himself. They were pursued to the gates of Ctesiphon; and the conquerors might have entered the dismayed city,[4] if their general, Victor,

[1] Libanius alludes to the most powerful of the generals. I have ventured to name *Sallust*. Ammianus says, of all the leaders, quod acri metû territi duces concordi precatû fieri prohibere tentarent.

[2] Hinc Imperator . . . (says Ammianus) ipse cum levis armaturæ auxiliis per prima postremaque discurrens, &c. Yet Zosimus, his friend, does not allow him to pass the river till two days after the battle.

[3] Secundum Homericam dispositionem. A similar disposition is ascribed to the wise Nestor, in the fourth book of the Iliad: and Homer was never absent from the mind of Julian.

[4] Persas terrore subito miscuerunt, versisque agminibus totius gentis, apertas Ctesiphontis portas victor miles intrâsset, ni major prædarum occasio fuisset, quem cura victoriæ (Sextus Rufus de Provinciis, c, 28.). Their avarice might dispose them to hear the advice of Victor.

who was dangerously wounded with an arrow, had not conjured them to desist from a rash attempt, which must be fatal, if it were not successful. On *their* side, the Romans acknowledged the loss of only seventy-five men; while they affirmed, that the Barbarians had left on the field of battle 2500, or even 6000, of their bravest soldiers. The spoil was such as might be expected from the riches and luxury of an oriental camp; large quantities of silver and gold, splendid arms and trappings, and beds and tables of massy silver. The victorious emperor distributed, as the rewards of valour, some honourable gifts, civic, and mural, and naval crowns; which he, and perhaps he alone, esteemed more precious than the wealth of Asia. A solemn sacrifice was offered to the god of war, but the appearances of the victims threatened the most inauspicious events; and Julian soon discovered, by less ambiguous signs, that he had now reached the term of his prosperity.[1]

On the second day (A. D. 363. June) after the battle, the domestic guards, the Jovians and Herculians, and the remaining troops, which composed near two-thirds of the whole army, were securely wafted over the Tigris.[2] While the Persians beheld from the walls of Ctesiphon the desolation of the adjacent country, Julian cast many an anxious look towards the North, in full expectation, that as he himself had victoriously penetrated to the capital of Sapor, the march and junction of his lieutenants, Sebastian and Procopius, would be executed with the same courage and diligence. His expectations were disappointed by the treachery of the Armenian king, who permitted, and most probably directed, the desertion of his auxiliary troops from the camp of the Romans;[3] and by the dissensions of the two generals, who were incapable of forming or executing any plan for the public service. When the emperor had relinquished the hope of this important reinforcement, he condescended to hold a council of war, and approved, after a full debate, the sentiment of those generals, who dissuaded the siege of Ctesiphon, as a fruitless and pernicious undertaking. It is not easy for us to conceive, by what arts of fortification, a city thrice besieged and taken by the predecessors of Julian, could be rendered impregnable against an army of 60,000 Romans, commanded by a brave and experienced general, and abundantly supplied with ships, provisions, battering engines, and military stores. But we may rest assured, from the love of glory, and contempt of danger, which formed the character of Julian, that he was not discouraged by any trivial or imaginary obstacles.[4] At the very time when he declined

[1] The labour of the canal, the passage of the Tigris, and the victory, are described by Ammian. (xxiv. 5, 6.), Liban. (Orat. Paren. c. 124. p. 347.), Greg. Naz. (Orat. iv. 115.), Zos. (l. iii. 181.), and Sextus Rufus (de Prov. c. 28.).

[2] The fleet and army were formed in three divisions, of which the first only had passed during the night (Ammian. xxiv. 6.). The παση δορυφορια, whom Zosimus transports on the third day (l. iii. 183.), might consist of the protectors, among whom the historian Ammianus, and the future emperor Jovian, actually served; some *schools* of the *domestics*, and perhaps the Jovians and Herculians, who often did duty as guards.

[3] Moses of Chorene (Hist. Armen. l. iii. c. 15. p. 246.) supplies us with a national tradition, and a spurious letter. I have borrowed only the leading circumstance, which is consistent with truth, probability, and Liban. (Orat. Paren. c. 131. p. 355.).

[4] Civitas inexpugnabilis, facinus audax et importunum. Ammian. xxiv. 7. His fellow-soldier, Eutropius, turns aside from the difficulty, Assyriamque populatus, castra apud Ctesiphontem stativa aliquandiu habuit: remeansque victor, &c. x. 16. Zosimus is artful or ignorant, and Socrates inaccurate.

the siege of Ctesiphon, he rejected, with obstinacy and disdain, the most flattering offers of a negociation of peace. Sapor, who had been so long accustomed to the tardy ostentation of Constantius, was surprised by the intrepid diligence of his successor. As far as the confines of India and Scythia, the satraps of the distant provinces were ordered to assemble their troops, and to march, without delay, to the assistance of their monarch. But their preparations were dilatory, their motions slow; and before Sapor could lead an army into the field, he received the melancholy intelligence of the devastation of Assyria, the ruin of his palaces, and the slaughter of his bravest troops, who defended the passage of the Tigris. The pride of royalty was humbled in the dust; he took his repasts on the ground; and the disorder of his hair expressed the grief and anxiety of his mind. Perhaps he would not have refused to purchase, with one half of his kingdom, the safety of the remainder; and he would have gladly subscribed himself, in a treaty of peace, the faithful and dependent ally of the Roman conqueror. Under the pretence of private business, a minister of rank and confidence was secretly dispatched to embrace the knees of Hormisdas, and to request, in the language of a suppliant, that he might be introduced into the presence of the emperor. The Sassanian prince, whether he listened to the voice of pride or humanity, whether he consulted the sentiments of his birth or the duties of his situation, was equally inclined to promote a salutary measure, which would terminate the calamities of Persia, and secure the triumph of Rome. He was astonished by the inflexible firmness of a hero, who remembered, most unfortunately for himself, and for his country, that Alexander had uniformly rejected the propositions of Darius. But as Julian was sensible, that the hope of a safe and honourable peace might cool the ardour of his troops; he earnestly requested, that Hormisdas would privately dismiss the minister of Sapor, and conceal this dangerous temptation from the knowledge of the camp.[1]

The honour, as well as interest, of Julian, forbade him to consume his time under the impregnable walls of Ctesiphon; and as often as he defied the Barbarians, who defended the city, to meet him on the open plain, they prudently replied, that if he desired to exercise his valour, he might seek the army of the Great King. He felt the insult, and he accepted the advice. Instead of confining his servile march to the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris, he resolved to imitate the adventurous spirit of Alexander, and boldly to advance into the inland provinces, till he forced his rival to contend with him, perhaps in the plain of Arbela, for the empire of Asia. The magnanimity of Julian was applauded and betrayed, by the arts of a noble Persian, who, in the cause of his country, had generously submitted to act a part full of danger, of falsehood, and of shame.[2] With a train of faithful followers, he deserted to the Imperial camp; exposed, in a specious tale, the in-

[1] Liban. Orat. Paren. c. 130. p. 354. c. 139. p. 361. Socr. l. iii. c. 21. The ecclesiastical historian imputes the refusal of peace to the advice of Maximus. Such advice was unworthy of a philosopher; but the philosopher was likewise a magician, who flattered the hopes and passions of his master.

[2] The arts of this new Zopyrus (Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 115.), may derive some credit from the testimony of two abbreviators (Sextus Rufus and Victor), and the casual hints of Liban. (Orat. Paren. c. 134. p. 357.) and Ammian. (xxiv. 7.). The course of genuine history is interrupted by a most unseasonable chasm in the text of Ammianus.

juries which he had sustained; exaggerated the cruelty of Sapor, the discontent of the people, and the weakness of the monarchy; and confidently offered himself as the hostage and guide of the Roman march. The most rational grounds of suspicion were urged, without effect, by the wisdom and experience of Hormisdas; and the credulous Julian, receiving the traitor into his bosom, was persuaded to issue an hasty order, which, in the opinion of mankind, appeared to arraign his prudence, and to endanger his safety. He destroyed, in a single hour, the whole navy, which had been transported above 500 miles, at so great an expence of toil, of treasure, and of blood. Twelve, or, at the most, twenty-two, small vessels were saved, to accompany, on carriages, the march of the army, and to form occasional bridges for the passage of the rivers. A supply of twenty days' provisions was reserved for the use of the soldiers; and the rest of the magazines, with a fleet of 1100 vessels, which rode at anchor in the Tigris, were abandoned to the flames, by the absolute command of the emperor. The Christian bishops, Gregory and Augustin, insult the madness of the apostate, who executed, with his own hands, the sentence of divine justice. Their authority, of less weight, perhaps, in a military question, is confirmed by the cool judgment of an experienced soldier, who was himself spectator of the conflagration, and who could not disapprove the reluctant murmurs of the troops.[1] Yet there are not wanting some specious, and perhaps solid, reasons, which might justify the resolution of Julian. The navigation of the Euphrates never ascended above Babylon, nor that of the Tigris above Opis.[2] The distance of the last-mentioned city from the Roman camp was not very considerable; and Julian must soon have renounced the vain and impracticable attempt of forcing upwards a great fleet against the stream of a rapid river,[3] which in several places was embarrassed by natural or artificial cataracts.[4] The power of sails or oars was insufficient; it became necessary to tow the ships against the current of the river; the strength of 20,000 soldiers was exhausted in this tedious and servile labour; and if the Romans continued to march along the banks of the Tigris, they could only expect to return home without achieving any enterprize worthy of the genius or fortune of their leader. If, on the contrary, it was advisable to advance into the inland country, the destruction of the fleet and magazines was the only measure which could save that valuable prize from the hands of the numerous and active troops which might suddenly be poured from the gates of Ctesiphon. Had the arms of Julian been victorious, we should now admire the conduct, as well as the courage, of a hero, who, by depriving his soldiers of the hopes of a retreat, left them only the alternative of death or conquest.[5]

[1] Ammian. (xxiv. 7.), Liban. (Orat. Paren. c. 132, 133. p. 356.), Zos. (l. iii. 183.), Zon. (ii. l. xiii. 26.), Greg. (Orat. iv. 116.), August. (de Civ. Dei, l. iv. c. 29. l. v. c. 21.). Of these, Libanius alone attempts a faint apology for his hero; who, according to Ammianus, pronounced his own condemnation, by a tardy and ineffectual attempt to extinguish the flames.

[2] Herodotus (l. i. c. 194.), Strabo (l. xvi. 1074.), Tavernier (p. i. l. ii. 152.).

[3] A celeritate Tigris incipit vocari, ita appellant Medi sagittam. Plin. Hist. Nat. vi. 31.

[4] One of these dykes, which produces an artificial cascade or cataract, is described by Tavernier (part i. l. ii. 226.) and Thevenot (part ii. l. i. 193.). The Persians, or Assyrians, laboured to interrupt the navigation of the river (Strabo, l. xv. 1075. D'Anville, l'Euph. et le Tigre, p. 98.).

[5] Recollect the successful and applauded rashness of Agathocles and Cortez, who burnt their ships on the coasts of Africa and Mexico.

The cumbersome train of artillery and waggons, which retards the operations of a modern army, were in a great measure unknown in the camps of the Romans.[1] Yet, in every age, the subsistence of 60,000 men must have been one of the most important cares of a prudent general; and that subsistence could only be drawn from his own or from the enemy's country. Had it been possible for Julian to maintain a bridge of communication on the Tigris, and to preserve the conquered places of Assyria, a desolated province could not afford any large or regular supplies, in a seaon of the year when the lands were covered by the inundation of the Euphrates,[2] and the unwholesome air was darkened with swarms of innumerable insects.[3] The appearance of the hostile country was far more inviting. The extensive region that lies between the river Tigris and the mountains of Media, was filled with villages and towns; and the fertile soil, for the most part, was in a very improved state of cultivation. Julian might expect, that a conqueror, who possessed the two forcible instruments of persuasion, steel and gold, would easily procure a plentiful subsistence from the fears or avarice of the natives. But, on the approach of the Romans, this rich and smiling prospect was instantly blasted. Wherever they moved, the inhabitants deserted the open villages, and took shelter in the fortified towns; the cattle was driven away; the grass and ripe corn were consumed with fire; and, as soon as the flames had subsided which interrupted the march of Julian, he beheld the melancholy face of a smoking and naked desert. This desperate but effectual method of defence, can only be executed by the enthusiasm of a people who prefer their independence to their property; or by the rigour of an arbitrary government, which consults the public safety without submitting to their inclinations the liberty of choice. On the present occasion, the zeal and obedience of the Persians seconded the commands of Sapor; and the emperor was soon reduced to the scanty stock of provisions, which continually wasted in his hands. Before they were entirely consumed, he might still have reached the wealthy and unwarlike cities of Ecbatana, or Susa, by the effort of a rapid and well-directed march;[4] but he was deprived of this last resource by his ignorance of the roads, and by the perfidy of his guides. The Romans wandered several days in the country to the eastward of Bagdad: the Persian deserter, who had artfully led them into the snare, escaped from their resentment; and his followers, as soon as they were put to the torture, confessed the secret of the conspiracy. The visionary conquest of Hyrcania and India, which had so long amused, now tormented, the mind of Julian. Conscious that his own imprudence was the

[1] Essai sur la Tactique, ii. 287. and M. Guichardt, Nouv. Mem. Milit. i. 351. on the baggage and subsistence of the Roman armies.

[2] The Tigris rises to the S., the Euphrates to the N., of the Armenian mountains. The former overflows in March, the latter in July. These circumstances are well explained in the Geog. Dissert. of Foster, in Spelman's Expedition of Cyrus, ii. 26.

[3] Ammian. (xxiv. 8.) describes, as he had felt, the inconveniency of the flood, the heat, and the insects. The lands of Assyria, oppressed by the Turks, and ravaged by the Curds, or Arabs, yield an increase of 10, 15, and 20 fold, for the seed which is cast into the ground by the wretched and unskilful husbandman. Voyages de Niebuhr, ii. 279.

[4] Isidore of Charax (Mansion. Parthic. p. 5. in Hudson, Geog. Minor, ii.) reckons 129 schæni from Seleucia, and Thevenot (part i. l. i, ii. 209.), 128 hours of march from Bagdad to Ecbatana, or Hamadam. These measures cannot exceed an ordinary parasang, or 3 Roman miles.

cause of the public distress, he anxiously balanced the hopes of safety or success, without obtaining a satisfactory answer either from gods or men. At length, as the only practicable measure, he embraced the resolution of directing his steps towards the banks of the Tigris, with the design of saving the army by a hasty march to the confines of Corduene; a fertile and friendly province, which acknowledged the sovereignty of Rome. The desponding troops obeyed the signal (June 16) of the retreat, only seventy days after they had passed the Chaboras, with the sanguine expectation of subverting the throne of Persia.[1]

As long as the Romans seemed to advance into the country, their march was observed and insulted from a distance, by several bodies of Persian cavalry; who showing themselves sometimes in loose, and sometimes in closer, order, faintly skirmished with the advanced guards. These detachments were, however, supported by a much greater force; and the heads of the columns were no sooner pointed towards the Tigris, than a cloud of dust arose on the plain. The Romans, who now aspired only to the permission of a safe and speedy retreat, endeavoured to persuade themselves, that this formidable appearance was occasioned by a troop of wild asses, or perhaps by the approach of some friendly Arabs. They halted, pitched their tents, fortified their camp, passed the whole night in continual alarms; and discovered, at the dawn of day, that they were surrounded by an army of Persians. This army, which might be considered only as the van of the Barbarians, was soon followed by the main body of cuirassiers, archers, and elephants, commanded by Meranes, a general of rank and reputation. He was accompanied by two of the king's sons, and many of the principal satraps; and fame and expectation exaggerated the strength of the remaining powers, which slowly advanced under the conduct of Sapor himself. As the Romans continued their march, their long array, which was forced to bend, or divide, according to the varieties of the ground, afforded frequent and favourable opportunities to their vigilant enemies. The Persians repeatedly charged with fury; they were repeatedly repulsed with firmness; and the action at Maronga, which almost deserved the name of a battle, was marked by a considerable loss of satraps and elephants, perhaps of equal value in the eyes of their monarch. These splendid advantages were not obtained without an adequate slaughter on the side of the Romans: several officers of distinction were either killed or wounded; and the emperor himself, who, on all occasions of danger, inspired and guided the valour of his troops, was obliged to expose his person, and exert his abilities. The weight of offensive and defensive arms, which still constituted the strength and safety of the Romans, disabled them from making any long or effectual pursuit; and as the horsemen of the East were trained to dart their javelins, and shoot their arrows, at full speed, and in every possible direction,[2] the cavalry of Persia was never

[1] The march of Julian from Ctesiphon is circumstantially, but not clearly, described by Ammian. (xxiv. 7, 8.), Liban. (Orat. Paren. c. 134. p. 357.), and Zos. (l. iii. 183.). The two last seem ignorant that their conqueror was retreating; and Libanius absurdly confines him to the banks of the Tigris.

[2] Chardin, the most judicious of modern travellers, describes (iii. 57. ed. 4to.) the education and dexterity of the Persian horsemen. Brissonius (de Reg. Persico, p. 650.) has collected the testimonies of antiquity.

more formidable than in the moment of a rapid and disorderly flight. But the most certain and irreparable loss of the Romans, was that of time. The hardy veterans, accustomed to the cold climate of Gaul and Germany, fainted under the sultry heat of an Assyrian summer; their vigour was exhausted by the incessant repetition of march and combat; and the progress of the army was suspended by the precautions of a slow and dangerous retreat, in the presence of an active enemy. Every day, every hour, as the supply diminished, the value and price of subsistence increased in the Roman camp.[1] Julian, who always contented himself with such food as a hungry soldier would have disdained, distributed, for the use of the troops, the provisions of the Imperial household, and whatever could be spared from the sumpter-horses of the tribunes and generals. But this feeble relief served only to aggravate the sense of the public distress; and the Romans began to entertain the most gloomy apprehensions, that before they could reach the frontiers of the empire, they should all perish, either by famine, or by the sword of the Barbarians.[2]

While Julian struggled with the almost insuperable difficulties of his situation, the silent hours of the night were still devoted to study and contemplation. Whenever he closed his eyes in short and interrupted slumbers, his mind was agitated with painful anxiety; nor can it be thought surprising, that the Genius of the empire should once more appear before him, covering with a funereal veil, his head, and his horn of abundance, and slowly retiring from the Imperial tent. The monarch started from his couch, and stepping forth, to refresh his wearied spirits with the coolness of the midnight air, he beheld a fiery meteor, which shot athwart the sky, and suddenly vanished. Julian was convinced that he had seen the menacing countenance of the god of war;[3] the council which he summoned, of Tuscan Haruspices,[4] unanimously pronounced that he should abstain from action: but on this occasion, necessity and reason were more prevalent than superstition; and the trumpets sounded at the break of day. The army marched through a hilly country; and the hills had been secretly occupied by the Persians. Julian led the van, with the skill and attention of a consummate general; he was alarmed by the intelligence that his rear was suddenly attacked. The heat of the weather had tempted him to lay aside his cuirass; but he snatched a shield from one of his attendants, and hastened, with a sufficient reinforcement, to the relief of the rear-guard. A similar danger recalled the intrepid prince to the defence of the front; and as he galloped between the columns, the centre of the left was attacked, and almost overpowered, by a furious charge of the

[1] In Mark Antony's retreat, an attic chœnix sold for 50 drachmæ, or, in other words, a pound of flour for 12 or 14 shillings: barley-bread was sold for its weight in silver. It is impossible to peruse the interesting narrative of Plutarch (v. 102.), without perceiving that Mark Antony and Julian were pursued by the same enemies, and involved in the same distress.

[2] Ammian. xxiv. 8. xxv. 1. Zos. l. iii. 184. Liban. Orat. Paren. c. 134. p. 357. The sophist of Antioch appears ignorant that the troops were hungry.

[3] Ammian. xxv. 2. Julian had sworn in a passion, nunquam se Marti sacra facturum (xxiv. 6.). Such whimsical quarrels were not uncommon between the gods and their insolent votaries; and even the prudent Augustus, after his fleet had been twice shipwrecked, excluded Neptune from the honours of public processions. Hume's Essays, vol. ii. 418.

[4] They still retained the monopoly of the vain, but lucrative, science, which had been invented in Etruria, and professed to derive their knowledge of signs and omens from the ancient books of Tarquitius, a Tuscan sage.

Persian cavalry and elephants. This huge body was soon defeated, by the well-timed evolution of the light infantry, who aimed their weapons, with dexterity and effect, against the backs of the horsemen and the legs of the elephants. The Barbarians fled; and Julian, who was foremost in every danger, animated the pursuit with his voice and gestures. His trembling guards, scattered and oppressed by the disorderly throng of friends and enemies, reminded their fearless sovereign that he was without armour; and conjured him to decline the fall of the impending ruin. As they exclaimed,[1] a cloud of darts and arrows was discharged from the flying squadrons; and a javelin, after razing the skin of his arm, transpierced the ribs, and fixed in the interior part of the liver. Julian attempted to draw the deadly weapon from his side; but his fingers were cut by the sharpness of the steel, and he fell senseless from his horse. His guards flew to his relief; and the wounded emperor was gently raised from the ground, and conveyed out of the tumult of the battle into an adjacent tent. The report of the melancholy event passed from rank to rank; but the grief of the Romans inspired them with invincible valour, and the desire of revenge. The bloody and obstinate conflict was maintained by the two armies, till they were separated by the total darkness of the night. The Persians derived some honour from the advantage which they obtained against the left wing, where Anatolius, master of the offices, was slain, and the præfect Sallust very narrowly escaped. But the event of the day was adverse to the Barbarians. They abandoned the field; their two generals, Meranes and Nohordates,[2] fifty nobles or satraps, and a multitude of their bravest soldiers: and the success of the Romans, if Julian had survived, might have been improved into a decisive and useful victory.

The first words that Julian uttered (A.D. 363. June 26), after his recovery from the fainting fit, into which he had been thrown by loss of blood, were expressive of his martial spirit. He called for his horse and arms, and was impatient to rush into the battle. His remaining strength was exhausted by the painful effort; and the surgeons, who examined his wound, discovered the symptoms of approaching death. He employed the awful moments with the firm temper of a hero and a sage; the philosophers who had accompanied him in this fatal expedition, compared the tent of Julian with the prison of Socrates; and the spectators, whom duty, or friendship, or curiosity, had assembled round his couch, listened with respectful grief to the funeral oration of their dying emperor.[3] "Friends and fellow-soldiers, the seasonable "period of my departure is now arrived, and I discharge, with the "cheerfulness of a ready debtor, the demands of nature. I have "learned from philosophy, how much the soul is more excellent "than the body; and that the separation of the nobler substance,

[1] Clamabant hinc inde *candidati* (see the note of Valesius) quos disjecerat terror, ut fugientium molem tanquam ruinam male compositi culminis declinaret. Ammian. xxv. 3.

[2] Sapor himself declared to the Romans, that it was his practice, to comfort the families of his deceased satraps, by sending them, as a present, the heads of the guards and officers who had not fallen by their master's side. Liban. de nece Julian. ulcis. c. xiii. 163.

[3] The character and situation of Julian might countenance the suspicion, that he had previously composed the elaborate oration, which Ammianus heard, and has transcribed. The version of La Bleterie is faithful and elegant. I have followed him in expressing the Platonic idea of emanations, which is darkly insinuated in the original.

"should be the subject of joy, rather than of affliction. I have "learned from religion, that an early death has often been the reward "of piety;[1] and I accept, as a favour of the gods, the mortal stroke, "that secures me from the danger of disgracing a character, which "has hitherto been supported by virtue and fortitude. I die without "remorse, as I have lived without guilt. I am pleased to reflect on "the innocence of my private life; and I can affirm with confidence, "that the supreme authority, that emanation of the Divine Power, "has been preserved in my hands pure and immaculate. Detesting "the corrupt and destructive maxims of despotism, I have considered "the happiness of the people as the end of government. Submitting "my actions to the laws of prudence, of justice, and of moderation, I "have trusted the event to the care of Providence. Peace was the "object of my counsels, as long as peace was consistent with the "public welfare; but when the imperious voice of my country sum-"moned me to arms, I exposed my person to the dangers of war, with "the clear fore-knowledge (which I had acquired from the art of divin-"ation) that I was destined to fall by the sword. I now offer my "tribute of gratitude to the Eternal Being, who has not suffered me "to perish by the cruelty of a tyrant, by the secret dagger of con-"spiracy, or by the slow tortures of lingering disease. He has given "me, in the midst of an honourable career, a splendid and glorious "departure from this world; and I hold it equally absurd, equally "base, to solicit, or to decline, the stroke of fate.——Thus much I "have attempted to say; but my strength fails me, and I feel the "approach of death.—I shall cautiously refrain from any word that "may tend to influence your suffrages in the election of an emperor. "My choice might be imprudent, or injudicious; and if it should not "be ratified by the consent of the army, it might be fatal to the person "whom I should recommend. I shall only, as a good citizen, express "my hopes, that the Romans may be blessed with the government of "a virtuous sovereign." After this discourse, which Julian pronounced in a firm and gentle tone of voice, he distributed, by a military testament,[2] the remains of his private fortune; and making some enquiry why Anatolius was not present, he understood, from the answer of Sallust, that Anatolius was killed; and bewailed, with amiable inconsistency, the loss of his friend. At the same time he reproved the immoderate grief of the spectators; and conjured them not to disgrace, by unmanly tears, the fate of a prince, who in a few moments would be united with heaven, and with the stars.[3] The spectators were silent; and Julian entered into a metaphysical argument with the philosophers Priscus and Maximus, on the nature of the soul. The efforts which he made, of mind, as well as body, most probably

[1] Herodot. (l. i. c. 31.) has displayed that doctrine in an agreeable tale. Yet the Jupiter (Iliad, book 16.), who laments with tears of blood the death of Sarpedon his son, had a very imperfect notion of happiness or glory beyond the grave.

[2] The soldiers who made their verbal, or nuncupatory, testaments upon actual service (in procinctû) were exempted from the formalities of the Roman law. Heineccius (Antiq. Jur. Roman. i. 504.) and Montesq. (Esprit des Loix, l. xxvii.).

[3] This union of the human soul with the divine ætherial substance of the universe, is the ancient doctrine of Pythagoras and Plato; but it seems to exclude any personal or conscious immortality. Warburton's Divine Legation, ii. 199.

hastened his death. His wound began to bleed with fresh violence; his respiration was embarrassed by the swelling of the veins: he called for a draught of cold water, and, as soon as he had drank it, expired without pain, about the hour of midnight. Such was the end of that extraordinary man, in the thirty-second year of his age, after a reign of one year and about eight months, from the death of Constantius. In his last moments he displayed, perhaps with some ostentation, the love of virtue and of fame, which had been the ruling passions of his life.[1]

The triumph of Christianity, and the calamities of the empire (A.D. 363. June 27), may, in some measure, be ascribed to Julian himself, who had neglected to secure the future execution of his designs, by the timely and judicious nomination of an associate and successor. But the royal race of Constantius Chlorus was reduced to his own person; and if he entertained any serious thoughts of investing with the purple the most worthy among the Romans, he was diverted from his resolution by the difficulty of the choice, the jealousy of power, the fear of ingratitude, and the natural presumption of health, of youth, and of prosperity. His unexpected death left the empire without a master, and without an heir, in a state of perplexity and danger, which, in the space of fourscore years, had never been experienced, since the election of Diocletian. In a government, which had almost forgotten the distinction of pure and noble blood, the superiority of birth was of little moment; the claims of official rank were accidental and precarious; and the candidates, who might aspire to ascend the vacant throne, could be supported only by the consciousness of personal merit, or by the hopes of popular favour. But the situation of a famished army, encompassed on all sides by an host of Barbarians, shortened the moments of grief and deliberation. In this scene of terror and distress, the body of the deceased prince, according to his own directions, was decently embalmed; and, at the dawn of day, the generals convened a military senate, at which the commanders of the legions, and the officers, both of cavalry and infantry, were invited to assist. Three or four hours of the night had not passed away without some secret cabals; and when the election of an emperor was proposed, the spirit of faction began to agitate the assembly. Victor and Arinthæus collected the remains of the court of Constantius; the friends of Julian attached themselves to the Gallic chiefs, Dagalaiphus and Nevitta; and the most fatal consequences might be apprehended from the discord of two factions, so opposite in their character and interest, in their maxims of government, and perhaps in their religious principles. The superior virtues of Sallust could alone reconcile their divisions, and unite their suffrages; and the venerable præfect would immediately have been declared the successor of Julian, if he himself, with sincere and modest firmness, had not alleged his age and infirmities, so unequal to the weight of the diadem. The generals, who were surprised and perplexed by his refusal, showed some dis-

[1] The whole relation of the death of Julian is given by Ammian. (xxv. 3.), an intelligent spectator. Libanius, who turns with horror from the scene, has supplied some circumstances (Orat. Paren. c. 136—140. p. 359.). The calumnies of Gregory, and the legends of more ancient saints, may now be *silently* despised.

position to adopt the salutary advice of an inferior officer,[1] that they should act as they would have acted in the absence of the emperor; that they should exert their abilities to extricate the army from the present distress; and, if they were fortunate enough to reach the confines of Mesopotamia, they should proceed with united and deliberate counsels in the election of a lawful sovereign. While they debated, a few voices saluted Jovian, who was no more than *first*[2] of the domestics, with the names of Emperor and Augustus. The tumultuary acclamation was instantly repeated by the guards who surrounded the tent, and passed, in a few minutes, to the extremities of the line. The new prince, astonished with his own fortune, was hastily invested with the Imperial ornaments, and received an oath of fidelity from the generals, whose favour and protection he so lately solicited. The strongest recommendation of Jovian was the merit of his father, Count Varronian, who enjoyed, in honourable retirement, the fruit of his long services. In the obscure freedom of a private station, the son indulged his taste for wine and women; yet he supported, with credit, the character of a Christian[3] and a soldier. Without being conspicuous for any of the ambitious qualifications which excite the admiration and envy of mankind, the comely person of Jovian, his cheerful temper, and familiar wit, had gained the affection of his fellow-soldiers; and the generals of both parties acquiesced in a popular election, which had not been conducted by the arts of their enemies. The pride of this unexpected elevation was moderated by the just apprehension, that the same day might terminate the life and reign of the new emperor. The pressing voice of necessity was obeyed without delay; and the first orders issued by Jovian, a few hours after his predecessor had expired, were to prosecute a march, which could alone extricate the Romans from their actual distress.[4]

The esteem of an enemy is most sincerely expressed by his fears; and the degree of fear may be accurately measured by the joy with which he celebrates his deliverance. The welcome news of the death of Julian, which a deserter revealed to the camp of Sapor, inspired the desponding monarch with a sudden confidence of victory. He immediately detached the royal cavalry, perhaps the ten thousand *Immortals*,[5] to second and support the pursuit; and discharged the whole weight of his united forces on the rear-guard of the Romans. The rear-guard was thrown into disorder; the renowned legions, which

[1] Honoratior aliquis miles; perhaps Ammianus himself. The modest and judicious historian describes the scene of the election, at which he was undoubtedly present (xxv. 5.).

[2] The *primus*, or *primicerius*, enjoyed the dignity of a senator; and though only a tribune, he ranked with the military dukes. Cod. Theod. l. vi. tit. xxiv. These privileges are perhaps more recent than the time of Jovian.

[3] The ecclesiastical historians, Socr. (l. iii. c. 22.), Soz. (l. vi. c. 3.), and Theod. (l. iv. c. 1.), ascribe to Jovian the merit of a confessor under the preceding reign; and piously suppose, that he refused the purple, till the whole army unanimously exclaimed that they were Christians. Ammianus, calmly pursuing his narrative, overthrows the legend by a single sentence. Hostiis pro Joviano extisque inspectis, pronuntiatum est, &c. xxv. 6.

[4] Ammian. (xxv. 10.) has drawn from the life an impartial portrait of Jovian: to which the younger Victor has added some remarkable strokes. La Bleterie (Hist. de Jov. i. 1—238.) has composed an elaborate history of his short reign; a work remarkably distinguished by elegance of style, critical disquisition, and religious prejudice.

[5] Regius equitatus. It appears from Procopius, that the Immortals, so famous under Cyrus and his successors, were revived, if we may use that improper word, by the Sassanides. Brisson de Regno Persico, p. 268.

derived their titles from Diocletian, and his warlike colleague, were broke and trampled down by the elephants; and three tribunes lost their lives in attempting to stop the flight of their soldiers. The battle was at length restored by the persevering valour of the Romans; the Persians were repulsed with a great slaughter of men and elephants; and the army, after marching and fighting a long summer's day, arrived, in the evening, at Samara on the banks of the Tigris, about 100 miles above Ctesiphon.[1] On the ensuing day, the Barbarians, instead of harassing the march, attacked the camp, of Jovian; which had been seated in a deep and sequestered valley. From the hills, the archers of Persia insulted and annoyed the wearied legionaries, and a body of cavalry, which had penetrated with desperate courage through the Prætorian gate, was cut in pieces, after a doubtful conflict, near the Imperial tent. In the succeeding night, the camp of Carche was protected by the lofty dykes of the river; and the Roman army, though incessantly exposed to the vexatious pursuit of the Saracens, pitched their tents near the city of Dura,[2] four days after the death of Julian. The Tigris was still on their left; their hopes and provisions were almost consumed; and the impatient soldiers, who had fondly persuaded themselves that the frontiers of the empire were not far distant, requested their new sovereign, that they might be permitted to hazard the passage of the river. With the assistance of his wisest officers, Jovian endeavoured to check their rashness; by representing, that if they possessed sufficient skill and vigour to stem the torrent of a deep and rapid stream, they would only deliver themselves naked and defenceless to the Barbarians, who had occupied the opposite banks. Yielding at length to their clamorous importunities, he consented, with reluctance, that 500 Gauls and Germans, accustomed from their infancy to the waters of the Rhine and Danube, should attempt the bold adventure, which might serve either as an encouragement, or as a warning, for the rest of the army. In the silence of the night, they swam the Tigris, surprised an unguarded post of the enemy, and displayed at the dawn of day the signal of their resolution and fortune. The success of this trial disposed the emperor to listen to the promises of his architects, who proposed to construct a floating bridge of the inflated skins of sheep, oxen, and goats, covered with a floor of earth and fascines.[3] Two important days were spent in the ineffectual labour; and the Romans, who already endured the miseries of famine, cast a look of despair on the Tigris, and upon the Barbarians; whose numbers and obstinacy increased with the distress of the Imperial army.[4]

[1] The obscure villages of the inland country are irrecoverably lost, nor can we name the field of battle where Julian fell: but M. d'Anville has demonstrated the precise situation of Sumere, Carche, and Dura, along the banks of the Tigris (Geog. Anc. ii. 248. l'Euph. et le Tigre, p. 95.). In the ninth century, Sumere, or Samara, became, with a slight change of name, the royal residence of the Khalifs of the house of Abbas.

[2] Dura was a fortified place in the wars of Antiochus against the rebels of Media and Persia (Polybius, l. v. c. 48. 52. p. 548. ed. Casaubon, 8vo.).

[3] A similar expedient was proposed to the leaders of the ten thousand, and wisely rejected. Xenoph. Anab. l. iii. 255. It appears, from our modern travellers, that rafts floating on bladders perform the trade and navigation of the Tigris.

[4] The first military acts of the reign of Jovian are related by Ammian. (xxv. 6.), Liban. (Orat. Paren. c. 146. p. 364.). and Zos. (l. iii. 189.). Though we may distrust the fairness of

In this hopeless situation, the fainting spirits of the Romans were revived by the sound of peace. The transient presumption of Sapor had vanished: he observed, with serious concern, that, in the repetition of doubtful combats, he had lost his most faithful and intrepid nobles, his bravest troops, and the greatest part of his train of elephants: and the experienced monarch feared to provoke the resistance of despair, the vicissitudes of fortune, and the unexhausted powers of the Roman empire; which might soon advance to relieve, or to revenge, the successor of Julian. The Surenas himself, accompanied by another satrap, appeared in the camp of Jovian;[1] and declared, that the clemency of his sovereign was not averse to signify the conditions, on which he would consent to spare and to dismiss the Cæsar, with the relics of his captive army. The hopes of safety subdued the firmness of the Romans; the emperor was compelled, by the advice of his council, and the cries of the soldiers, to embrace the offer of peace; and the præfect Sallust was immediately sent, with the general Arinthæus, to understand the pleasure of the Great King. The crafty Persian delayed, under various pretences, the conclusion of the agreement; started difficulties, required explanations, suggested expedients, receded from his concessions, increased his demands, and wasted four days in the arts of negociation, till he had consumed the stock of provisions which yet remained in the camp of the Romans. Had Jovian been capable of executing a bold and prudent measure, he would have continued his march with unremitting diligence; the progress of the treaty would have suspended the attacks of the Barbarians; and, before the expiration of the fourth day, he might have safely reached the fruitful province of Corduene, at the distance only of 100 miles.[2] The irresolute emperor, instead of breaking through the toils of the enemy, expected his fate with patient resignation; and accepted the humiliating conditions of peace, which it was no longer in his power to refuse. The five provinces beyond the Tigris, which had been ceded by the grandfather of Sapor, were restored to the Persian monarchy. He acquired, by a single article, the impregnable city of Nisibis; which had sustained, in three successive sieges, the effort of his arms. Singara, and the castle of the Moors, one of the strongest places of Mesopotamia, were likewise dismembered from the empire. It was considered as an indulgence, that the inhabitants of those fortresses were permitted to retire with their effects; but the conqueror rigorously insisted that the Romans should for ever abandon the king and kingdom of Armenia. A peace, or rather a long truce, of thirty years, was stipulated between the hostile nations; the faith of the treaty was ratified by solemn oaths, and religious ceremonies;

Libanius, the ocular testimony of Eutrop. (uno a Persis atque altero prælio victus, x. 17.) must incline us to suspect, that Ammianus has been too jealous of the honour of the Roman arms.

Sextus Rufus (de Prov. c. 29.) embraces a poor subterfuge of national vanity. Tanta reverentia nominis Romani fuit, ut a Persis *primus* de pace sermo haberetur.

[2] It is presumptuous to controvert the opinion of Ammianus, a soldier and a spectator. Yet it is difficult to understand, *how* the mountains of Corduene could extend over the plain of Assyria, as low as the conflux of the Tigris and the great Zab: or *how* an army of 60,000 men could march 100 miles in 4 days.

and hostages of distinguished rank were reciprocally delivered to secure the performance of the conditions.[1]

The sophist of Antioch, who saw with indignation the sceptre of his hero in the feeble hand of a Christian successor, professes to admire the moderation of Sapor, in contenting himself with so small a portion of the Roman empire. If he had stretched as far as the Euphrates the claims of his ambition, he might have been secure, says Libanius, of not meeting with a refusal. If he had fixed, as the boundary of Persia, the Orontes, the Cydnus, the Sangarius, or even the Thracian Bosphorus, flatterers would not have been wanting in the court of Jovian to convince the timid monarch, that his remaining provinces would still afford the most ample gratifications of power and luxury.—*Liban. Orat. Paren.* c. 143. p. 364. Without adopting in its full force this malicious insinuation, we must acknowledge, that the conclusion of so ignominious a treaty was facilitated by the private ambition of Jovian. The obscure domestic, exalted to the throne by fortune, rather than by merit, was impatient to escape from the hands of the Persians; that he might prevent the designs of Procopius, who commanded the army of Mesopotamia, and establish his doubtful reign over the legions and provinces, which were still ignorant of the hasty and tumultuous choice of the camp beyond the Tigris.[2] In the neighbourhood of the same river, at no very considerable distance from the fatal station of Dura,[3] the ten thousand Greeks, without generals, or guides, or provisions, were abandoned, above 1200 miles from their native country, to the resentment of a victorious monarch. The difference of *their* conduct and success depended much more on their character than on their situation. Instead of tamely resigning themselves to the secret deliberations and private views of a single person, the united councils of the Greeks were inspired by the generous enthusiasm of a popular assembly; where the mind of each citizen is filled with the love of glory, the pride of freedom, and the contempt of death. Conscious of their superiority over the Barbarians in arms and discipline, they disdained to yield, they refused to capitulate; every obstacle was surmounted by their patience, courage, and military skill; and the memorable retreat of the ten thousand exposed and insulted the weakness of the Persian monarchy.[4]

As the price of his disgraceful concessions, the emperor might perhaps have stipulated, that the camp of the hungry Romans should

[1] The treaty of Dura is recorded with grief or indignation by Ammian. (xxv. 7.), Liban. (Orat. Paren. c. 142. p. 364.), Zos. (l. iii. p. 190.), Greg. Naz. (Orat. iv. 117, who imputes the distress to Julian, the deliverance to Jovian), and Eutrop. (x. 17.). The last-mentioned writer, who was present in a military station, styles this peace necessarium quidem sed ignobilem.

[2] Conditionibus . . . dispendiosis Romanæ reipublicæ Impositis . . . . quibus cupidior regni quam gloriæ Jovianus imperio rudis adquievit. Sext. Rufus de Prov. c. 29. La Bleterie has expressed, in a long direct oration, these specious considerations of public and private interest (Hist. de Jov. i. 39.).

[3] The generals were murdered on the banks of the Zabatus (Anabasis, l. ii. 156. l. iii. 226.), or great Zab, a river of Assyria, 400 feet broad, which falls into the Tigris 14 hours below Mosul. The error of the Greeks bestowed on the great and lesser Zab the names of the *Wolf* (Lycus), and the *Goat* (Capros). They created these animals to attend the *Tyger* of the East.

[4] The *Cyropædia* is vague and languid: the *Anabasis* circumstantial and animated. Such is the eternal difference between fiction and truth.

be plentifully supplied;[1] and that they should be permitted to pass the Tigris on the bridge which was constructed by the hands of the Persians. But, if Jovian presumed to solicit those equitable terms, they were sternly refused by the haughty tyrant of the East; whose clemency had pardoned the invaders of his country. The Saracens sometimes intercepted the stragglers of the march; but the generals and troops of Sapor respected the cessation of arms: and Jovian was suffered to explore the most convenient place for the passage of the river. The small vessels, which had been saved from the conflagration of the fleet, performed the most essential service. They first conveyed the emperor and his favourites; and afterwards transported, in many successive voyages, a great part of the army. But, as every man was anxious for his personal safety, and apprehensive of being left on the hostile shore, the soldiers, who were too impatient to wait the slow returns of the boats, boldly ventured themselves on light hurdles, or inflated skins; and, drawing after them their horses, attempted, with various success, to swim across the river. Many of these daring adventurers were swallowed by the waves; many others, who were carried along by the violence of the stream, fell an easy prey to the avarice, or cruelty, of the wild Arabs: and the loss which the army sustained in the passage of the Tigris, was not inferior to the carnage of a day of battle. As soon as the Romans had landed on the western bank, they were delivered from the hostile pursuit of the Barbarians; but, in a laborious march of 200 miles over the plains of Mesopotamia, they endured the last extremities of thirst and hunger. They were obliged to traverse a sandy desert, which, in the extent of 70 miles, did not afford a single blade of sweet grass, nor a single spring of fresh water; and the rest of the inhospitable waste was untrod by the footsteps either of friends or enemies. Whenever a small measure of flour could be discovered in the camp, twenty pounds weight were greedily purchased with ten pieces of gold:[2] the beasts of burden were slaughtered and devoured; and the desert was strewed with the arms and baggage of the Roman soldiers, whose tattered garments and meagre countenances displayed their past sufferings and actual misery. A small convoy of provisions advanced to meet the army as far as the castle of Ur; and the supply was the more grateful, since it declared the fidelity of Sebastian and Procopius. At Thilsaphata,[3] the emperor most graciously received the generals of Mesopotamia; and the remains of a once flourishing army at length reposed themselves under the walls of Nisibis. The messengers of Jovian had already pro-

[1] According to Rufinus, an immediate supply of provisions was stipulated by the treaty; and Theodoret affirms, that the obligation was faithfully discharged by the Persians. Such a fact is probable, but undoubtedly false. Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. iv. 702.

[2] We may recollect some lines of Lucan (Pharsal. iv. 95.), who describes a similar distress of Cæsar's army in Spain:

Sæva fames aderat———— Exiguam Cererem. Proh lucri pallida tabes!
Miles eget: toto censû non prodigus emit Non deest prolato jejunus venditor auro.

Guichardt (Nouv. Mem. Milit. i. 379.). His Analysis of the two Campaigns in Spain and Africa, is the noblest monument that has ever been raised to the fame of Cæsar.

[3] M. d'Anville (Maps, and l'Euph. et le Tigre, p. 92.) traces their march, and assigns the true position of Hatra, Ur, and Thilsaphata, which Ammianus has mentioned. He does not complain of the Samiel, the deadly hot wind, which Thevenot (Voyag. part ii. l. i. 192.) so much dreaded.

claimed, in the language of flattery, his election, his treaty, and his return; and the new prince had taken the most effectual measures to secure the allegiance of the armies and provinces of Europe, by placing the military command in the hands of those officers, who, from motives of interest, or inclination, would firmly support the cause of their benefactor.[1]

The friends of Julian had confidently announced the success of his expedition. They entertained a fond persuasion, that the temples of the gods would be enriched with the spoils of the East; that Persia would be reduced to the humble state of a tributary province, governed by the laws and magistrates of Rome; that the Barbarians would adopt the dress, and manners, and language of their conquerors; and that the youth of Ecbatana and Susa would study the art of rhetoric under Grecian masters.[2] The progress of the arms of Julian interrupted his communication with the empire; and, from the moment that he passed the Tigris, his affectionate subjects were ignorant of the fate and fortunes of their prince. Their contemplation of fancied triumphs was disturbed by the melancholy rumour of his death; and they persisted to doubt, after they could no longer deny, the truth of that fatal event.[3] The messengers of Jovian promulgated the specious tale of a prudent and necessary peace: the voice of fame, louder and more sincere, revealed the disgrace of the emperor, and the conditions of the ignominious treaty. The minds of the people were filled with astonishment and grief, with indignation and terror, when they were informed, that the unworthy successor of Julian relinquished the five provinces, which had been acquired by the victory of Galerius; and that he shamefully surrendered to the Barbarians the important city of Nisibis, the firmest bulwark of the provinces of the East.[4] The deep and dangerous question, how far the public faith should be observed, when it becomes incompatible with the public safety, was freely agitated in popular conversation; and some hopes were entertained, that the emperor would redeem his pusillanimous behaviour by a splendid act of patriotic perfidy. The inflexible spirit of the Roman senate had always disclaimed the unequal conditions which were extorted from the distress of her captive armies; and, if it were necessary to satisfy the national honour, by delivering the guilty general into the hands of the Barbarians, the greatest part of the subjects of Jovian would have cheerfully acquiesced in the precedent of ancient times.[5]

[1] The retreat of Jovian is described by Ammian. (xxv. 9.), Liban. (Orat. Paren. c. 143. p. 365.), and Zos. (l. iii. 194.).

[2] Liban. Orat. Paren. c. 145. p. 366. Such were the natural hopes and wishes of a rhetorician.

[3] The people of Carrhæ, a city devoted to Paganism, buried the inauspicious messenger under a pile of stones (Zos. l. iii. 196.). Libanius, when he received the fatal intelligence, cast his eye on his sword: but he recollected that Plato had condemned suicide, and that he must live to compose the panegyric of Julian (Liban. de Vitâ suâ, ii. 45.).

[4] Ammianus and Eutropius may be admitted as fair and credible witnesses of the public language and opinions. The people of Antioch reviled an ignominious peace, which exposed them to the Persians, on a naked and defenceless frontier (Excerpt. Vales. p. 845. ex Johanno Antiocheno.).

[5] La Bleterie (Hist. de Jovien, i. 212.), though a severe casuist, has pronounced that Jovian was not bound to execute his promise; since he *could not* dismember the empire, nor alienate, without their consent, the allegiance of his people. I have never found much delight or instruction in such political metaphysics.

But the emperor, whatever might be the limits of his constitutional authority, was the absolute master of the laws and arms of the state; and the same motives which had forced him to subscribe, now pressed him to execute, the treaty of peace. He was impatient to secure an empire at the expence of a few provinces; and the respectable names of religion and honour concealed the personal fears and the ambition of Jovian. Notwithstanding the dutiful solicitations of the inhabitants, decency, as well as prudence, forbade the emperor to lodge in the palace of Nisibis; but, the next morning after his arrival, Bineses, the ambassador of Persia, entered the place, displayed from the citadel the standard of the Great King, and proclaimed, in his name, the cruel alternative of exile or servitude. The principal citizens of Nisibis, who, till that fatal moment, had confided in the protection of their sovereign, threw themselves at his feet. They conjured him not to abandon, or, at least, not to deliver, a faithful colony to the rage of a Barbarian tyrant, exasperated by the three successive defeats, which he had experienced under the walls of Nisibis. They still possessed arms and courage to repel the invaders of their country: they requested only the permission of using them in their own defence; and, as soon as they had asserted their independence, they should implore the favour of being again admitted into the rank of his subjects. Their arguments, their eloquence, their tears, were ineffectual. Jovian alleged, with some confusion, the sanctity of oaths; and, as the reluctance with which he accepted the present of a crown of gold, convinced the citizens of their hopeless condition, the advocate Sylvanus was provoked to exclaim, "O Emperor! may you thus be crowned by all "the cities of your dominions!" Jovian, who in a few weeks had assumed the habits of a prince,[1] was displeased with freedom, and offended with truth: and as he reasonably supposed, that the discontent of the people might incline them to submit to the Persian government, he published an edict, under pain of death, that they should leave the city within the term of three days. Ammianus has delineated in lively colours the scene of universal despair which he seems to have viewed with an eye of compassion (xxv. 9. and *Zos.* l. iii. p. 194). The martial youth deserted, with indignant grief, the walls which they had so gloriously defended: the disconsolate mourner dropt a last tear over the tomb of a son or husband, which must soon be profaned by the rude hand of a Barbarian master; and the aged citizen kissed the threshold, and clung to the doors, of the house, where he had passed the cheerful and careless hours of infancy. The highways were crowded with a trembling multitude: the distinctions of rank, and sex, and age, were lost in the general calamity. Every one strove to bear away some fragment from the wreck of his fortunes; and as they could not command the immediate service of an adequate number of horses or waggons, they were obliged to leave behind them the greatest part of their valuable effects. The savage insensibility of Jovian appears to have aggravated the hardships of these unhappy fugitives. They were seated, however, in a new-built quarter of Amida; and that rising city, with the rein-

[1] At Nisibis he performed a *royal* act. A brave officer, his name-sake, who had been thought worthy of the purple, was dragged from supper, thrown into a well, and stoned to death, without any form of trial or evidence of guilt. Ammian. xxv. 8.

forcement of a very considerable colony, soon recovered its former splendour, and became the capital of Mesopotamia.[1] Similar orders were dispatched by the emperor for the evacuation of Singara and the castle of the Moors; and for the restitution of the five provinces beyond the Tigris. Sapor enjoyed the glory and the fruits of his victory; and this ignominious peace has justly been considered as a memorable æra in the decline and fall of the Roman empire. The predecessors of Jovian had sometimes relinquished the dominion of distant and unprofitable provinces: but, since the foundation of the city, the genius of Rome, the god Terminus, who guarded the boundaries of the republic, had never retired before the sword of a victorious enemy.[2]

After Jovian had performed those engagements, which the voice of his people might have tempted him to violate, he hastened away from the scene of his disgrace, and proceeded with his whole court to enjoy the luxury of Antioch.[3] Without consulting the dictates of religious zeal, he was prompted by humanity and gratitude, to bestow the last honours on the remains of his deceased sovereign:[4] and Procopius, who sincerely bewailed the loss of his kinsman, was removed from the command of the army, under the decent pretence of conducting the funeral. The corpse of Julian was transported from Nisibis to Tarsus, in a slow march of fifteen days; and, as it passed through the cities of the East, was saluted by the hostile factions, with mournful lamentations and clamorous insults. The Pagans already placed their beloved hero in the rank of those gods whose worship he had restored; while the invectives of the Christians pursued the soul of the apostate to hell, and his body to the grave.[5] One party lamented the approaching ruin of their altars; the other celebrated the marvellous deliverance of the church. The Christians applauded, in lofty and ambiguous strains, the stroke of divine vengeance, which had been so long suspended over the guilty head of Julian. They acknowledged, that the death of the tyrant, at the instant he expired beyond the Tigris, was *revealed* to the saints of Egypt, Syria, and Cappadocia;[6] and, instead of suffering him to fall by the Persian darts, their indiscretion ascribed the heroic deed to the obscure hand of some mortal or immortal champion of the faith.[7] Such imprudent declarations were eagerly adopted by the malice, or credulity, of their adversaries;[8] who darkly insinuated, or confidently asserted, that the

[1] Chron. Paschal, p. 300. The ecclesiastical Notitiæ may be consulted.

[2] Zos. l. iii. 192. Sex. Rufus de Provinciis, c. 29. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. iv. c. 29. This general position must be applied and interpreted with some caution.

[3] Ammian. xxv. 9. Zos. l. iii. 196. He might be edax, et vino Venerique indulgens. But I agree with La Bleterie (i. 148.), in rejecting the foolish report of a Bacchanalian riot (ap. Suidam) celebrated at Antioch, by the emperor, his *wife*, and a troop of concubines.

[4] La Bleterie (i. 150. 209.) handsomely exposes the brutal bigotry of Baronius, who would have thrown Julian to the dogs, ne cespititiâ quidem sepulturâ dignus.

[5] Compare the sophist and the saint (Liban. Monod. ii. 251. and Orat. Paren. c. 145. p. 367. c. 156. p. 377. with Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 125.). The Christian orator faintly mutters some exhortations to modesty and forgiveness: but he is well satisfied, that the real sufferings of Julian will far exceed the fabulous torments of Ixion or Tantalus.

[6] Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. iv. 549.) has collected these visions.

[7] Soz. (l. vi. 2.) applauds the Greek doctrine of *tyrannicide;* but the whole passage, which a Jesuit might have translated, is prudently suppressed by the president Cousin.

[8] Immediately after the death of Julian, an uncertain rumour was scattered, telo cecidisse Romano. It was carried, by some deserters, to the Persian camp; and the Romans were reproached as the assassins of the emperor by Sapor and his subjects (Ammian. xxv. 6. Liban. de ulciscendâ Juliani nece, c. xiii. 162.). It was urged, as a decisive proof, that no

governors of the church had instigated and directed the fanaticism of a domestic assassin.[1] Above sixteen years after the death of Julian, the charge was solemnly and vehemently urged, in a public oration, addressed by Libanius to the emperor Theodosius. His suspicions are unsupported by fact or argument; and we can only esteem the generous zeal of the sophist of Antioch, for the cold and neglected ashes of his friend.[2]

It was an ancient custom in the funerals, as well as in the triumphs, of the Romans, that the voice of praise should be corrected by that of satire and ridicule; and that, in the midst of the splendid pageants, which displayed the glory of the living or of the dead, their imperfections should not be concealed from the eyes of the world.[3] This custom was practised in the funeral of Julian. The comedians, who resented his contempt and aversion for the theatre, exhibited, with the applause of a Christian audience, the lively and exaggerated representation of the faults and follies of the deceased emperor. His various character and singular manners afforded an ample scope for pleasantry and ridicule.[4] In the exercise of his uncommon talents, he often descended below the majesty of his rank. Alexander was transformed into Diogenes; the philosopher was degraded into a priest. The purity of his virtue was sullied by excessive vanity; his superstition disturbed the peace, and endangered the safety, of a mighty empire; and his irregular sallies were the less entitled to indulgence, as they appeared to be the laborious efforts of art, or even of affectation. The remains of Julian were interred at Tarsus in Cilicia; but his stately tomb, which arose in that city, on the banks of the cold and lympid Cydnus,[5] was displeasing to the faithful friends, who loved and revered the memory of that extraordinary man. The philosopher expressed a very reasonable wish, that the disciple of Plato might have reposed amidst the groves of the Academy:[6] while the soldier exclaimed in bolder accents, that the ashes of Julian should have been mingled with those of Cæsar, in the field of Mars, and among the ancient monuments of Roman virtue.[7] The history of princes does not very frequently renew the example of a similar competition.

Persian had appeared to claim the promised reward (Liban. Orat. Paren. c. 141. p. 363.). But the flying horseman, who darted the fatal javelin, might be ignorant of its effects; or he might be slain in the same action. Ammianus neither feels nor inspires a suspicion.

[1] Ος τις εντολην πληρων τῳ σφων αυτων αρχοντι. This dark and ambiguous expression may point to Athanasius, the first, without a rival, of the Christian clergy (Liban. de ulcis. Jul. nece, c. 5. p. 149. La Bleterie, Hist. de Jovien, i. 179.).

[2] The Orator (Fabric. Bibl. Græc. vii. 145.) scatters suspicions, demands an inquiry, and insinuates that proofs might still be obtained. He ascribes the success of the Huns to the criminal neglect of revenging Julian's death.

[3] At the funeral of Vespasian, the comedian who personated that frugal emperor, anxiously inquired how much it cost—£80,000 (centies)—Give me the tenth part of the sum, and throw my body into the Tyber. Sueton. in Vespasian. c. 19. with the notes of Casaubon and Gronovius.

[4] Greg. (Orat. iv. 119.) compares this supposed ignominy and ridicule to the funeral honours of Constantius, whose body was chaunted over mount Taurus by a choir of angels.

[5] Quintus Curtius, l. iii. c. 4. The luxuriancy of his descriptions has been often censured. Yet it was almost the duty of the historian to describe a river, whose waters had nearly proved fatal to Alexander.

[6] Liban. Orat. Paren. c. 156. p. 377. Yet he acknowledges with gratitude the liberality of the two royal brothers in decorating the tomb of Julian (de ulcis. Jul. nece, c. 7. p. 152.).

[7] Cujus suprema et cineres, si qui tunc juste consuleret, non Cydnus videre deberet,

CHAPTER XXV.

The Government and Death of Jovian.—Election of Valentinian, who associates his Brother Valens, and makes the final Division of the Eastern and Western Empires.—Revolt of Procopius.—Civil and Ecclesiastical Administration.—Germany.—Britain.—Africa.—The East.—The Danube.—Death of Valentinian.—His two Sons, Gratian and Valentinian II., *succeed to the Western Empire.*

THE death of Julian had left the public affairs of the empire in a very doubtful and dangerous situation. The Roman army was saved (A.D. 363) by an inglorious, perhaps a necessary, treaty;[1] and the first moments of peace were consecrated by the pious Jovian to restore the domestic tranquillity of the church and state. The indiscretion of his predecessor, instead of reconciling, had artfully fomented, the religious war: and the balance which he affected to preserve between the hostile factions, served only to perpetuate the contest, by the vicissitudes of hope and fear, by the rival claims of ancient possession and actual favour. The Christians had forgotten the spirit of the Gospel; and the Pagans had imbibed the spirit of the church. In private families, the sentiments of nature were extinguished by the blind fury of zeal and revenge: the majesty of the laws was violated or abused; the cities of the East were stained with blood; and the most implacable enemies of the Romans were in the bosom of their country. Jovian was educated in the profession of Christianity; and as he marched from Nisibis to Antioch, the banner of the Cross, the LABARUM of Constantine, which was again displayed at the head of the legions, announced to the people the faith of their new emperor. As soon as he ascended the throne, he transmitted a circular epistle to all the governors of provinces; in which he confessed the divine truth, and secured the legal establishment, of the Christian religion. The insidious edicts of Julian were abolished; the ecclesiastical immunities were restored and enlarged; and Jovian condescended to lament, that the distress of the times obliged him to diminish the measure of charitable distributions.[2] The Christians were unanimous in the loud and sincere applause which they bestowed on the pious successor of Julian. But they were still ignorant what creed, or what synod, he would chuse for the standard of orthodoxy; and the peace of the church immediately revived those eager disputes which had been suspended during the season of persecution. The episcopal leaders of the contending sects, convinced, from experience, how much their fate would

quamvis gratissimus amnis et liquidus; sed ad perpetuandam gloriam recte factorum præterlambere Tiberis, in tersecans urbem æternam, divorumque veterum monumenta præstringens. Ammian. xxv. 10.

[1] The medals of Jovian adorn him with victories, laurel crowns, and prostrate captives. Ducange, Famil. Byzan. p. 52. Flattery is a foolish suicide: she destroys herself with her own hands.

[2] Jovian restored to the church τον αρχαιον κοσμον; a forcible and comprehensive expression Philostorg. l. viii. c. 5. Godefroy, p. 329. Soz. l. vi. c. 3.). The new law which condemned the rape or marriage of nuns (Cod. Theod. l. ix. tit. xxv. leg. 2.), is exaggerated by Sozomen.

depend on the earliest impressions that were made on the mind of an untutored soldier, hastened to the court of Edessa, or Antioch. The highways of the East were crowded with Homoousian, and Arian, and Semi-Arian, and Eunomian bishops, who struggled to outstrip each other in the race; the apartments of the palace resounded with their clamours; and the ears of the prince were assaulted, and perhaps astonished, by the singular mixture of metaphysical argument and passionate invective.[1] The moderation of Jovian, who recommended concord and charity, and referred the disputants to the sentence of a future council, was interpreted as a symptom of indifference; but his attachment to the Nicene creed was at length discovered and declared, by the reverence which he expressed for the[2] *cœlestial* virtues of the great Athanasius. The intrepid veteran of the faith, at the age of seventy, had issued from his retreat on the first intelligence of the tyrant's death. The acclamations of the people seated him once more on the archiepiscopal throne; and he wisely accepted, or anticipated, the invitation of Jovian. The venerable figure of Athanasius, his calm courage, and insinuating eloquence, sustained the reputation which he had already acquired in the courts of four successive princes.[3] As soon as he had gained the confidence, and secured the faith, of the Christian emperor, he returned in triumph to his diocese, and continued, with mature counsels, and undiminished vigour, to direct, ten years longer,[4] the ecclesiastical government of Alexandria, Egypt, and the Catholic church. Before his departure from Antioch, he assured Jovian that his orthodox devotion would be rewarded with a long and peaceful reign. Athanasius had reason to hope, that he should be allowed either the merit of a successful prediction, or the excuse of a grateful, though ineffectual, prayer.[5]

The slightest force, when it is applied to assist and guide the natural descent of its object, operates with irresistible weight; and Jovian had the good fortune to embrace the religious opinions which were supported by the spirit of the times, and the zeal and numbers of the most powerful sect.[6] Under his reign, Christianity obtained an easy and lasting victory; and as soon as the smile of royal patronage was withdrawn, the genius of paganism, which had been fondly raised and cherished by the arts of Julian, sunk irrecoverably in the dust. In many cities, the temples were shut or deserted; the philosophers, who

[1] Compare Socr. l. iii. c. 25. and Philostorg. l. viii. c. 6. with Godefroy, p. 330.

[2] The word *cœlestial* faintly expresses the impious and extravagant flattery of the emperor to the archbishop, της προς τον Θεον των ολων ομοιωσεως. (Athanas. ii. p. 33.) Greg. Naz. (Orat. xxi. 392.) celebrates the friendship of Jovian and Athanasius. The primate's journey was advised by the Egyptian monks (Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. viii. 221.).

[3] Athanasius, at the court of Antioch, is agreeably represented by La Bleterie (Hist. de Jovien, i. 121.): he translates the singular and original conferences of the emperor, the primate of Egypt, and the Arian deputies. The Abbé is not satisfied with the coarse pleasantry of Jovian; but his partiality for Athanasius assumes, in *his* eyes, the character of justice.

[4] The true æra of his death is perplexed with some difficulties (Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. viii. 719.). But the date (A.D. 373, May 2.) which seems the most consistent with history and reason, is ratified by his authentic life (Maffei Osservaz. Letter. iii. 81.).

[5] Observations of Valesius and Jortin (Remarks on Eccles. Hist. iv. 38.) on the original letter of Athanasius; which is preserved by Theod. (l. iv. c. 3.). In some MSS. this indiscreet promise is omitted; perhaps by the Catholics, jealous of the prophetic fame of their leader.

[6] Athanas. (apud Theod. l. iv. c. 3.) magnifies the number of the orthodox, who composed the whole world, παρεξ ολιγων των τα Αοειου φοονουντων. This assertion was verified in the space of 30 or 40 years.

had abused their transient favour, thought it prudent *to shave their beards*, and disguise their profession; and the Christians rejoiced, that they were now in a condition to forgive, or to revenge, the injuries which they had suffered under the preceding reign.[1] The consternation of the Pagan world was dispelled by a wise and gracious edict of toleration; in which Jovian explicitly declared, that although he should severely punish the sacrilegious rites of magic, his subjects might exercise, with freedom and safety, the ceremonies of the ancient worship. The memory of this law has been preserved by the orator, Themistius, who was deputed by the senate of Constantinople to express their loyal devotion for the new emperor. Themistius expatiates on the clemency of the Divine Nature, the facility of human error, the rights of conscience, and the independence of the mind; and, with some eloquence, inculcates the principles of philosophical toleration; whose aid Superstition herself, in the hour of her distress, is not ashamed to implore. He justly observes, that, in the recent changes, both religions had been alternately disgraced by the seeming acquisition of worthless proselytes, of those votaries of the reigning purple, who could pass, without a reason, and without a blush, from the church to the temple, and from the altars of Jupiter to the sacred table of the Christians.[2]

In the space of seven months, the Roman troops, who were now (A.D. 363. Oct.) returned to Antioch, had performed a march of 1500 miles; in which they had endured all the hardships of war, of famine, and of climate. Notwithstanding their services, their fatigues, and the approach of winter, the timid and impatient Jovian allowed only, to the men and horses, a respite of six weeks. The emperor could not sustain the indiscreet and malicious raillery of the people of Antioch.[3] He was impatient to possess the palace of Constantinople; and to prevent the ambition of some competitor, who might occupy the vacant allegiance of Europe. But he soon received the grateful intelligence, that his authority was acknowledged from the Thracian Bosphorus to the Atlantic ocean. By the first letters which he dispatched from the camp of Mesopotamia, he had delegated the military command of Gaul and Illyricum to Malarich, a brave and faithful officer of the nation of the Franks; and to his father-in-law, count Lucillian, who had formerly distinguished his courage and conduct in the defence of Nisibis. Malarich had declined an office to which he thought himself unequal; and Lucillian was massacred at Rheims, in an accidental mutiny of the Batavian cohorts.[4] But the

[1] Socr. l. iii. c. 24. Greg. Naz. (Orat. iv. 131.), and Liban. (Orat. Parent. c. 148. p. 369.), express the *living* sentiments of their respective factions.

[2] Themist. Orat. v. 63. ed. Paris, 1684. La Bleterie judiciously remarks (Hist. de Jovien, i. 199.), that Sozomen has forgot the general toleration; and Themistius, the establishment of the Catholic religion. Each of them turned away from the object which he disliked; and wished to suppress the part of the edict the least honourable, in his opinion, to the emperor Jovian.

[3] Οι δε Αντιοχεις ουχ ἡδεως διεκειντο προς αυτον: αλλ' επεσκωπτον αυτον ωδαις και παρωδιαιο, και τοις καλουμενοις φαμωσσοι (*famosis libellis*). Johan. Antiochen. in Excer. Vales. p. 845. The libels of Antioch may be admitted on very slight evidence.

[4] Ammian. (xxv. 10.) omits the name of the Batavians. Zosimus (l. iii. 197.) removes the scene of action from Rheims to Sirmium.

moderation of Jovinus, master-general of the cavalry, who forgave the intention of his disgrace, soon appeased the tumult, and confirmed the uncertain minds of the soldiers. The oath of fidelity was administered, and taken, with loyal acclamations; and the deputies of the Western armies[1] saluted their new sovereign as he descended from Mount Taurus to the city of Tyana, in Cappadocia. From Tyana he continued his hasty march to Ancyra, capital of the province of Galatia; where Jovian assumed, (A.D. 364. Jan. 1.) with his infant son, the name and ensigns of the consulship.[2] Dadastana,[3] an obscure town, almost at an equal distance between Ancyra and Nice, was marked for the fatal term of his journey and his life. After indulging himself with a plentiful, perhaps an intemperate, supper, he retired to rest; and the next morning (Feb. 17) the emperor Jovian was found dead in his bed. The cause of this sudden death was variously understood. By some it was ascribed to the consequences of an indigestion, occasioned either by the quantity of the wine, or the quality of the mushrooms, which he had swallowed in the evening. According to others, he was suffocated in his sleep by the vapour of charcoal; which extracted from the walls of the apartment the unwholesome moisture of the fresh plaister.[4] But the want of a regular enquiry into the death of a prince, whose reign and person were soon forgotten, appears to have been the only circumstance which countenanced the malicious whispers of poison and domestic guilt.[5] The body of Jovian was sent to Constantinople, to be interred with his predecessors; and the sad procession was met on the road by his wife Charito, the daughter of count Lucillian; who still wept the recent death of her father, and was hastening to dry her tears in the embraces of an Imperial husband. Her disappointment and grief were embittered by the anxiety of maternal tenderness. Six weeks before the death of Jovian, his infant son had been placed in the curule chair, adorned with the title of *Nobilissimus*, and the vain ensigns of the consulship. Unconscious of his fortune, the royal youth, who, from his grandfather, assumed the name of Varronian, was reminded only by the jealousy of the government, that he was the son of an emperor. Sixteen years afterwards he was still alive, but he had already been deprived of an eye; and his afflicted mother expected, every hour, that the innocent victim would be torn from her arms, to appease, with his blood, the suspicions of the reigning prince.[6]

[1] Quos capita scholarum ordo castrensis appellat. Ammian. xxv. 10. and Vales. ad locum.

[2] Cujus vagitus, pertinaciter reluctantis, ne in curuli sellâ veheretur ex more, id quod mox accidit protendebat. Augustus, and his successors, respectfully solicited a dispensation of age for the sons or nephews, whom they raised to the consulship. But the curule chair of the first Brutus had never been dishonoured by an infant.

[3] The Itinerary of Antoninus fixes Dadastana 125 Roman miles from Nice; 117 from Ancyra (Wessel. Itiner. p. 142.). The pilgrim of Bourdeaux, by omitting some stages, reduces the whole space from 284 to 181 miles. Wessel. p. 574.

[4] Ammian. (xxv. 10.), Eutrop. (x. 18.), who might likewise be present; Jerom (i. 26. ad Heliodorum), Oros. (vii. 31.), Soz. (l. vi. c. 6.), Zos. (l. iii. p. 197.), and Zon. (ii. l. xiii. 28.). We cannot expect a perfect agreement, and we shall not discuss minute differences.

[5] Ammianus, unmindful of his usual candour and good sense, compares the death of the harmless Jovian to that of the second Africanus, who had excited the fears and resentment of the popular faction.

[6] Chrysostom, i. 336. ed. Mountfaucon. The Christian orator attempts to comfort a widow by the examples of illustrious misfortunes; and observes, that of nine emperors (including the Cæsar Gallus), who had reigned in his time, only two (Constantine and Constantius) died a natural death. Such vague consolations have never wiped away a single tear.

After the death of Jovian, the throne of the Roman world remained ten days[1] (Feb. 17—26) without a master. The ministers and generals still continued to meet in council; to exercise their respective functions; to maintain the public order; and peaceably to conduct the army to the city of Nice, in Bithynia, which was chosen for the place of the election.[2] In a solemn assembly of the civil and military powers of the empire, the diadem was again unanimously offered to the præfect Sallust. He enjoyed the glory of a second refusal: and when the virtues of the father were alleged in favour of his son, the præfect, with the firmness of a disinterested patriot, declared to the electors, that the feeble age of the one, and the unexperienced youth of the other, were equally incapable of the laborious duties of government. Several canditates were proposed: and, after weighing the objections of character or situation, they were successively rejected: but, as soon as the name of Valentinian was pronounced, the merit of that officer united the suffrages of the whole assembly, and obtained the sincere approbation of Sallust himself. Valentinian[3] was the son of count Gratian, a native of Cibalis, in Pannonia, who, from an obscure condition, had raised himself, by matchless strength and dexterity, to the military commands of Africa and Britain; from which he retired, with an ample fortune and suspicious integrity. The rank and services of Gratian contributed, however, to smooth the first steps of the promotion of his son; and afforded him an early opportunity of displaying those solid and useful qualifications, which raised his charter above the ordinary level of his fellow-soldiers. The person of Valentinian was tall, graceful, and majestic. His manly countenance, deeply marked with the impression of sense and spirit, inspired his friends with awe and his enemies with fear: and, to second the efforts of his undaunted courage, the son of Gratian had inherited the advantages of a strong and healthy constitution. By the habits of chastity and temperance, which restrain the appetites, and invigorate the faculties, Valentinian preserved his own, and the public, esteem. The avocations of a military life had diverted his youth from the elegant pursuits of literature; he was ignorant of the Greek language, and the arts of rhetoric; but as the mind of the orator was never disconcerted by timid perplexity, he was able, as often as the occasion prompted him, to deliver his decided sentiments with bold and ready elocution. The laws of martial discipline were the only laws that he had studied; and he was soon distinguished by the laborious diligence, and inflexible severity, with which he discharged and inforced the duties of the camp. In the time of Julian he provoked the danger of disgrace by

[1] Ten days appear scarcely sufficient for the march and election. But it may be observed: 1. That the generals might command the expeditious use of the public posts for themselves, their attendants, and messengers. 2. That the troops, for the ease of the cities, marched in many divisions; and that the head of the column might arrive at Nice, when the rear halted at Ancyra.

[2] Ammian. xxvi. 1. Zos. l. iii. 198. Philostorg. l. viii. c. 8. Godefroy, p. 334. Philostorgius, who appears to have obtained some curious and authentic intelligence, ascribes the choice of Valentinian to the præfect Sallust, the master-general Arintheus, Dagalaiphus, count of the domestics, and the Patrician Datianus, whose pressing recommendations from Ancyra had a weighty influence in the election.

[3] Ammian. xxx. 7. 9.), and the younger Victor, have furnished the portraits of Valentinian; which naturally precedes and illustrates the history of his reign.

the contempt which he publicly expressed for the reigning religion;[1] and it should seem, from his subsequent conduct, that the indiscreet and unseasonable freedom of Valentinian was the effect of military spirit, rather than of Christian zeal. He was pardoned, however, and still employed by a prince who esteemed his merit:[2] and in the various events of the Persian war, he improved the reputation which he had already acquired on the banks of the Rhine. The celerity and success with which he executed an important commission, recommended him to the favour of Jovian; and to the honourable command of the second *school*, or company, of Targetteers, of the domestic guards. In the march from Antioch, he had reached his quarters at Ancyra, when he was unexpectedly summoned, without guilt, and without intrigue, to assume, in the forty-third year of his age, the absolute government of the Roman empire.

The invitation of the ministers and generals at Nice was of little moment, unless it were confirmed by the voice of the army. The aged Sallust, who had long observed the irregular fluctuations of popular assemblies, proposed, under pain of death, that none of those persons, whose rank in the service might excite a party in their favour, should appear in public, on the day of the inauguration. Yet such was the prevalence of ancient superstition, that a whole day was voluntarily added to this dangerous interval, because it happened to be the intercalation of the Bissextile.[3] At length (A.D. 364. Feb. 26), when the hour was supposed to be propitious, Valentinian showed himself from a lofty tribunal: the judicious choice was applauded; and the new prince was solemnly invested with the diadem and the purple, amidst the acclamations of the troops, who were disposed in martial order round the tribunal. But when he stretched forth his hand to address the armed multitude, a busy whisper was accidentally started in the ranks, and insensibly swelled into a loud and imperious clamour, that he should name, without delay, a colleague in the empire. The intrepid calmness of Valentinian obtained silence, and commanded respect; and he thus addressed the assembly: "A few "minutes since it was in *your* power, fellow-soldiers, to have left me in "the obscurity of a private station. Judging, from the testimony of "my past life, that I deserved to reign, you have placed me on the "throne. It is now *my* duty to consult the safety and interest of the "republic. The weight of the universe is undoubtedly too great for "the hands of a feeble mortal. I am conscious of the limits of my "abilities, and the uncertainty of my life; and far from declining, I "am anxious to solicit, the assistance of a worthy colleague. But,

[1] At Antioch, where he was obliged to attend the emperor to the temple, he struck a priest, who had presumed to purify him with lustral water (Soz. l. vi. c. 6. Theodor. l. iii. c. 15.). Such public defiance might become Valentinian; but it could leave no room for the unworthy delation of the philosopher Maximus, which supposes some more private offence (Zos. l. iv. 200.).

[2] Socr. l. iv. A previous exile to Melitene, or Thebais (the first might be possible), is interposed by Soz. (l. vi. c. 6.) and Philostorg. (l. vii. c. 7. with Godefroy, 293.).

[3] Ammianus, in a long, because unseasonable, digression (xxvi. 1. and Valesius ad loc.), rashly supposes that he understands an astronomical question, of which his readers are ignorant. It is treated with more judgment and propriety by Censorinus (de Die Natali, c. 20.), and Macrob. (Saturn. l. i. cap. 12—16.). The appellation of *Bissextile*, which marks the inauspicious year (Augustin. ad Januarium, Epist. 119.), is derived from the *repetition* of the *sixth* day of the calends of March.

"where discord may be fatal, the choice of a faithful friend requires "mature and serious deliberation. That deliberation shall be *my* "care. Let *your* conduct be dutiful and consistent. Retire to your "quarters; refresh your minds and bodies; and expect the accus-"tomed donative on the accession of a new emperor."[1] The astonished troops, with a mixture of pride, of satisfaction, and of terror, confessed the voice of their master. Their angry clamours subsided into silent reverence; and Valentinian, encompassed with the eagles of the legions, and the various banners of the cavalry and infantry, was conducted, in warlike pomp, to the palace of Nice. As he was sensible, however, of the importance of preventing some rash declaration of the soldiers, he consulted the assembly of the chiefs: and their real sentiments were concisely expressed by the generous freedom of Dagalaiphus. "Most excellent prince," said that officer, "if you con-"sider only your family, you have a brother; if you love the republic, "look round for the most deserving of the Romans."[2] The emperor, who suppressed his displeasure, without altering his intention, slowly proceeded from Nice to Nicomedia and Constantinople. In one of the suburbs of that capital (A.D. 364. Mar. 28),[3] thirty days after his own elevation, he bestowed the title of Augustus on his brother Valens; and as the boldest patriots were convinced, that their opposition, without being serviceable to their country, would be fatal to themselves, the declaration of his absolute will was received with silent submission. Valens was now in the thirty-sixth year of his age; but his abilities had never been exercised in any employment, military or civil; and his character had not inspired the world with any sanguine expectations. He possessed, however, one quality, which recommended him to Valentinian, and preserved the domestic peace of the empire; a devout and grateful attachment to his benefactor, whose superiority of genius, as well as of authority, Valens humbly and cheerfully acknowledged in every action of his life.[4]

Before Valentinian divided the provinces, he reformed the administration of the empire. All ranks of subjects, who had been injured or oppressed under the reign of Julian, were (A.D. 364. June) invited to support their public accusations. The silence of mankind attested the spotless integrity of the præfect Sallust;[5] and his own pressing solicitations, that he might be permitted to retire from the business of the state, were rejected by Valentinian with the most honourable expressions of friendship and esteem. But among the favourites of the late emperor, there were many who had abused his credulity or superstition; and who could no longer hope to be protected either by favour

[1] Valentinian's first speech is full in Ammian. (xxv. 2.); concise and sententious in Philostorg. (l. viii. c. 8.).

[2] Si tuos, amas, Imperator optime, habes fratrem; si Rempublicam, quære quem vestias. Ammian. xxvi. 4. In the division of the empire, Valentinian retained that sincere counsellor for himself (c. 6.).

[3] In suburbano, Ammian. xxvi. 4. The famous *Hebdomen*, or field of Mars, was distant from Constantinople either 7 stadia, or 7 miles. Valesius and his brother, ad loc. and Ducange, Const. l. ii. 140. 172.

[4] Participem quidem legitimum potestatis; sed in modum apparitoris morigerum, ut progrediens aperiet textus. Ammian. xxvi. 4.

[5] Notwithstanding the evidence of Zonaras, Suidas, and the Paschal Chronicle, M. de Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 671.) *wishes* to disbelieve these stories si avantageuses à un payen.

or justice.[1] The greater part of the ministers of the palace, and the governors of the provinces, were removed from their respective stations; yet the eminent merit of some officers was distinguished from the obnoxious crowd; and, notwithstanding the opposite clamours of zeal and resentment, the whole proceedings of this delicate enquiry appear to have been conducted with a reasonable share of wisdom and moderation.[2] The festivity of a new reign received a short and suspicious interruption, from the sudden illness of the two princes: but as soon as their health was restored, they left Constantinople in the beginning of the spring. In the castle or palace of Mediana, only three miles from Naissus, they executed the solemn and final division of the Roman empire.—*Ammianus*, xxvi. 5. Valentinian bestowed on his brother the rich præfecture of the *East*, from the Lower Danube to the confines of Persia; whilst he reserved for his immediate government the warlike præfectures of *Illyricum*, *Italy*, and *Gaul*, from the extremity of Greece to the Caledonian rampart; and from the rampart of Caledonia to the foot of Mount Atlas. The provincial administration remained on its former basis; but a double supply of generals and magistrates was required for two councils, and two courts: the division was made with a just regard to their peculiar merit and situation, and seven master-generals were soon created, either of the cavalry or infantry. When this important business had been amicably transacted, Valentinian and Valens embraced for the last time. The emperor of the West established his temporary residence at Milan; and the emperor of the East returned to Constantinople, to assume the dominion of fifty provinces, of whose language he was totally ignorant.[3]

The tranquillity of the East was soon (A.D. 365. Sept. 28) disturbed by rebellion; and the throne of Valens was threatened by the daring attempts of a rival, whose affinity to the emperor Julian [4] was his sole merit, and had been his only crime. Procopius had been hastily promoted from the obscure station of a tribune, and a notary, to the joint command of the army of Mesopotamia; the public opinion already named him as the successor of a prince who was destitute of natural heirs; and a vain rumour was propagated by his friends, or his enemies, that Julian, before the altar of the Moon, at Carrhæ, had privately invested Procopius with the Imperial purple.[5] He endeavoured, by his dutiful and submissive behaviour, to disarm the

[1] Eunapius celebrates and exaggerates the sufferings of Maximus (p. 82.): yet he allows, that this sophist or magician, the guilty favourite of Julian, and the personal enemy of Valentinian, was dismissed on the payment of a small fine.

[2] The loose assertions of a general disgrace (Zos. l. iv. 201.) are detected and refuted by Tillemont (v. 21.).

[3] Ammianus says, in general terms, subagrestis ingenii, nec bellicis nec liberalibus studiis eruditus. Ammian. xxxi. 14. The orator Themistius, with the genuine impertinence of a Greek, wished, for the first time, to speak the Latin language, the dialect of his sovereign, την διαλεκτον κρατουσαν. Orat. vi. 71.

[4] The uncertain degree of alliance, or consanguinity, is expressed by the words ανεψιος, cognatus, consobrinus (Valesius ad Ammian. xxiii. 3.). The mother of Procopius might be a sister of Basilina, and Count Julian, the mother and uncle of the apostate. Ducange, Fam. Byz. p. 49.

[5] Ammian. xxiii. 3. xxvi. 6. He mentions the report with much hesitation: susurravit obscurior fama; nemo enim dicti auctor exstitit verus. It serves, however, to mark, that Procopius was a pagan. Yet his religion does not appear to have promoted, or obstructed, his pretensions.

jealousy of Jovian; resigned, without a contest, his military command; and retired, with his wife and family, to cultivate the ample patrimony which he possessed in the province of Cappadocia. These useful and innocent occupations were interrupted by the appearance of an officer, with a band of soldiers, who, in the name of his new sovereigns, Valentinian and Valens, was dispatched to conduct the unfortunate Procopius, either to a perpetual prison, or an ignominious death. His presence of mind procured him a longer respite, and a more splendid fate. Without presuming to dispute the royal mandate, he requested the indulgence of a few moments, to embrace his weeping family; and, while the vigilance of his guards was relaxed by a plentiful entertainment, he dexterously escaped to the sea-coast of the Euxine, from whence he passed over to the country of Bosphorus. In that sequestered region he remained many months, exposed to the hardships of exile, of solitude, and of want; his melancholy temper brooding over his misfortunes, and his mind agitated by the just apprehension, that, if any accident should discover his name, the faithless Barbarians would violate, without much scruple, the laws of hospitality. In a moment of impatience and despair, Procopius embarked in a merchant vessel, which made sail for Constantinople; and boldly aspired to the rank of a sovereign, because he was not allowed to enjoy the security of a subject. At first he lurked in the villages of Bithynia, continually changing his habitation, and his disguise.[1] By degrees he ventured into the capital, trusted his life and fortune to the fidelity of two friends, a senator and an eunuch, and conceived some hopes of success, from the intelligence which he obtained of the actual state of public affairs. The body of the people was infected with a spirit of discontent: they regretted the justice and the abilities of Sallust, who had been imprudently dismissed from the præfecture of the East. They despised the character of Valens, which was rude without vigour, and feeble without mildness. They dreaded the influence of his father-in-law, the Patrician Petronius, a cruel and rapacious minister, who rigorously exacted all the arrears of tribute, that might remain unpaid since the reign of the emperor Aurelian. The circumstances were propitious to the designs of an usurper. The hostile measures of the Persians required the presence of Valens in Syria: from the Danube to the Euphrates the troops were in motion; and the capital was occasionally filled with the soldiers who passed, or repassed, the Thracian Bosphorus. Two cohorts of Gauls were persuaded to listen to the secret proposals of the conspirators; which were recommended by the promise of a liberal donative; and, as they still revered the memory of Julian, they easily consented to support the hereditary claims of his proscribed kinsman. At the dawn of day they were drawn up near the baths of Anastasia; and Procopius, clothed in a purple garment, more suitable to a player than to a monarch, appeared, as if he rose from the dead, in the midst of Constantinople. The soldiers, who were prepared for his reception, saluted their

[1] One of his retreats was a country-house of Eunomius, the heretic. The master was absent, innocent, ignorant: yet he narrowly escaped a sentence of death, and was banished into the remote parts of Mauritania (Philostorg. l. ix. c. 5. 8. Godefroy, p. 369.).

trembling prince with shouts of joy, and vows of fidelity. Their numbers were soon increased by a sturdy band of peasants, collected from the adjacent country; and Procopius, shielded by the arms of his adherents, was successively conducted to the tribunal, the senate, and the palace. During the first moments of his tumultuous reign, he was astonished and terrified by the gloomy silence of the people; who were either ignorant of the cause, or apprehensive of the event. But his military strength was superior to any actual resistance: the malecontents flocked to the standard of rebellion; the poor were excited by the hopes, and the rich were intimidated by the fear, of a general pillage; and the obstinate credulity of the multitude was once more deceived by the promised advantages of a revolution. The magistrates were seized; the prisons and arsenals broke open; the gates, and the entrance of the harbour, were diligently occupied; and, in a few hours, Procopius became the absolute, though precarious, master of the Imperial city. The usurper improved this unexpected success with some degree of courage and dexterity. He artfully propagated the rumours and opinions the most favourable to his interest; while he deluded the populace by giving audience to the frequent, but imaginary, ambassadors of distant nations. The large bodies of troops stationed in the cities of Thrace, and the fortresses of the Lower Danube, were gradually involved in the guilt of rebellion: and the Gothic princes consented to supply the sovereign of Constantinople with the formidable strength of several thousand auxiliaries. His generals passed the Bosphorus, and subdued, without an effort, the unarmed, but wealthy, provinces of Bithynia and Asia. After an honourable defence, the city and island of Cyzicus yielded to his power; the renowned legions of the Jovians and Herculians embraced the cause of the usurper, whom they were ordered to crush; and as the veterans were continually augmented with new levies, he soon appeared at the head of an army, whose valour, as well as numbers, were not unequal to the greatness of the contest. The son of Hormisdas,[1] a youth of spirit and ability, condescended to draw his sword against the lawful emperor of the East; and the Persian prince was immediately invested with the ancient and extraordinary powers of a Roman Proconsul. The alliance of Faustina, the widow of the emperor Constantius, who entrusted herself, and her daughter, to the hands of the usurper, added dignity and reputation to his cause. The princess Constantia, who was then about five years of age, accompanied, in a litter, the march of the army. She was shown to the multitude in the arms of her adopted father; and, as soon as she passed through the ranks, the tenderness of the soldiers was inflamed into martial fury:[2] they recollected the glories of the house of Con-

[1] Hormisdæ maturo juveni Hormisdæ regalis illius filio, potestatem Proconsulis detulit; et civilia, more veterum, et bella, recturo. Ammian. xxvi. 8. The Persian prince escaped with honour and safety, and was afterwards (A.D. 380.) restored to the same extraordinary office of proconsul of Bithynia (Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 204.). I am ignorant whether the race of Sassan was propagated. I find (A.D. 514.) a pope Hormisdas; but he was a native of Frusino, in Italy (Pagi. Brev. Pontific. i. 247.).

[2] The infant rebel was afterwards the wife of the emperor Gratian; but she died young and childless. Ducange, Fam. Byz. p. 48. 59.

stantine, and they declared, with loyal acclamation, that they would shed the last drop of their blood in the defence of the royal infant.[1]

In the mean while, Valentinian was alarmed and perplexed, by the doubtful intelligence of the revolt of the East. The difficulties of a German war forced him to confine his immediate care to the safety of his own dominions; and, as every channel of communication was stopt or corrupted, he listened, with a doubtful anxiety, to the rumours which were industriously spread, that the defeat and death of Valens had left Procopius sole master of the eastern provinces. Valens was not dead: but, on the news of the rebellion, which he received at Cæsarea, he basely despaired of his life and fortune; proposed to negociate with the usurper, and discovered his secret inclination to abdicate the Imperial purple. The timid monarch was saved from disgrace and ruin by the firmness of his ministers, and their abilities soon decided in his favour the event of the civil war. In a season of tranquillity, Sallust had resigned without a murmur; but as soon as the public safety was attacked, he ambitiously solicited the pre-eminence of toil and danger; and the restoration of that virtuous minister to the præfecture of the East, was the first step which indicated the repentance of Valens, and satisfied the minds of the people. The reign of Procopius was apparently supported by powerful armies, and obedient provinces. But many of the principal officers, military as well as civil, had been urged, either by motives of duty or interest, to withdraw themselves from the guilty scene; or to watch the moment of betraying, and deserting, the cause of the usurper. Lupicinus advanced, by hasty marches, to bring the legions of Syria to the aid of Valens. Arintheus, who, in strength, beauty, and valour, excelled all the heroes of the age, attacked with a small troop a superior body of the rebels. When he beheld the faces of the soldiers who had served under his banner, he commanded them, with a loud voice, to seize and deliver up their pretended leader; and such was the ascendant of his genius, that this extraordinary order was instantly obeyed.[2] Arbetio, a respectable veteran of the Great Constantine, who had been distinguished by the honours of the consulship, was persuaded to leave his retirement, and once more to conduct an army into the field. In the heat of action, calmly taking off his helmet, he showed his grey hairs, and venerable countenance; saluted the soldiers of Procopius by the endearing names of children and companions, and exhorted them, no longer to support the desperate cause of a contemptible tyrant; but to follow their old commander, who had so often led them to honour and victory. In the two engagements of Thyatira[3] and Nacosia, the unfortunate Procopius was deserted by

[1] Sequimini culminis summi prosapiam, was the language of Procopius; who affected to despise the obscure birth, and fortuitous election, of the upstart Pannonian. Ammianus, xxvi. 7.

[2] Et dedignatus hominem superare certamine despicabilem, auctoritatis et celsi fiduciâ corporis, ipsis hostibus jussit, suum vincire rectorem: atque ita turmarum antesignanus umbratilis comprensus suorum manibus. The strength and beauty of Arintheus, the new Hercules, are celebrated by St. Basil; who supposes that God had created him as an inimitable model of the human species. The painters and sculptors could not express his figure; the historians appeared fabulous when they related his exploits (Ammian. xxvi. and Valesius ad locum.).

[3] The same field of battle is placed by Ammianus in Lycia, and by Zosimus at Thyatira;

his troops, who were seduced by the instructions and example of their perfidious officers. After wandering some time among the woods and mountains of Phrygia, he was betrayed by his desponding followers, conducted to the Imperial camp (A.D. 366. May 28), and immediately beheaded. He suffered the ordinary fate of an unsuccessful usurper; but the acts of cruelty which were exercised by the conqueror, under the forms of legal justice, excited the pity and indignation of mankind.[1]

Such indeed are the common and natural fruits of despotism and rebellion. But the inquisition into the crime of magic (A.D. 373), which, under the reign of the two brothers, was so rigorously prosecuted both at Rome and Antioch, was interpreted as the fatal symptom, either of the displeasure of heaven, or of the depravity of mankind.[2] Let us not hesitate to indulge a liberal pride, that, in the present age, the enlightened part of Europe has abolished[3] a cruel and odious prejudice, which reigned in every climate of the globe, and adhered to every system of religious opinions.[4] The nations, and the sects, of the Roman world, admitted with equal credulity, and similar abhorrence, the reality of that infernal art,[5] which was able to control the eternal order of the planets, and the voluntary operations of the human mind. They dreaded the mysterious power of spells and incantations, of potent herbs, and execrable rites; which could extinguish or recall life, inflame the passions of the soul, blast the works of creation, and extort from the reluctant dæmons the secrets of futurity. They believed, with the wildest inconsistency, that this præternatural dominion of the air, of earth, and of hell, was exercised, from the vilest motives of malice or gain, by some wrinkled hags, and itinerant sorcerers, who passed their obscure lives in penury and contempt.[6] The arts of magic were equally condemned by the public opinion, and by the laws of Rome; but as they tended to gratify the most imperious passions of the heart of man, they were continually proscribed, and continually practised.[7] An imaginary cause is capable of producing

which are at the distance of 150 miles from each other. But Thyatira alluitur *Lyco* (Plin. Hist. Nat. v. 31. Cellarius, Geog. Antiq. ii. 79.); and the transcribers might easily convert an obscure river into a well-known province.

[1] The adventures, usurpation, and fall of Procopius, are related, in a regular series, by Ammian. (xxvi. 6—10.) and Zos. (l. iv. 203.). They often illustrate, and seldom contradict, each other. Themist. (Orat. vii. 91.) adds some base panegyric; and Eunap. (p. 83.) some malicious satire.

[2] Liban. de ulciscend. Julian. nece, c. ix. 158. The sophist deplores the public frenzy, but he does not (after their deaths) impeach the justice of the emperors.

[3] The French and English lawyers, of the present age, allow the *theory*, and deny the *practice*, of witchcraft (Denisart, Recueil de Decis. de Jurisprud. au mot *Sorciers*, iv. 553. Blackstone's Com. iv 60.). As private reason always prevents, or outstrips, public wisdom, Montesq. (Esprit des Loix, l. xii. c. 5, 6.) rejects the *existence* of magic.

[4] Oeuvres de Bayle, iii. 567. The sceptic of Rotterdam exhibits, according to his custom, a strange medley of loose knowledge and lively wit.

[5] The pagans distinguished between good and bad magic, the Theurgic and the Goetic (Hist. de l'Acad. &c. vii. 25.). But they could not have defended this obscure distinction against the acute logic of Bayle. In the Jewish and Christian system, *all* dæmons are infernal spirits; and *all* commerce with them is idolatry, apostacy, &c. which deserves death and damnation.

[6] The Canidia of Horace (Carm. l. v. od. 5. with Dacier's and Sanadon's illustrat.) is a vulgar witch. The Erictho of Lucan (Pharsal. vi. 430.) is tedious, disgusting, but sometimes sublime. She chides the delay of the Furies; and threatens, with tremendous obscurity, to pronounce their real names; to reveal the true infernal countenance of Hecate; to invoke the secret powers that lie *below* hell, &c.

[7] Genus hominum potentibus infidum, sperantibus fallax, quod in civitate nostrâ et veta

the most serious and mischievous effects. The dark predictions of the death of an emperor, or the success of a conspiracy, were calculated only to stimulate the hopes of ambition, and to dissolve the ties of fidelity; and the intentional guilt of magic was aggravated by the actual crimes of treason and sacrilege.[1] Such vain terrors disturbed the peace of society, and the happiness of individuals; and the harmless flame which insensibly melted a waxen image, might derive a powerful and pernicious energy from the affrighted fancy of the person whom it was maliciously designed to represent.[2] From the infusion of those herbs, which were supposed to possess a supernatural influence, it was an easy step to the use of more substantial poison; and the folly of mankind sometimes became the instrument, and the mask, of the most atrocious crimes. As soon as the zeal of informers was encouraged by the ministers of Valens and Valentinian, they could not refuse to listen to another charge, too frequently mingled in the scenes of domestic guilt; a charge of a softer and less malignant nature, for which the pious, though excessive, rigour of Constantine had recently decreed the punishment of death.[3] This deadly and incoherent mixture of treason and magic, of poison and adultery, afforded infinite gradations of guilt and innocence, of excuse and aggravation, which in these proceedings appear to have been confounded by the angry or corrupt passions of the judges. They easily discovered, that the degree of their industry and discernment was estimated, by the Imperial court, according to the number of executions that were furnished from their respective tribunals. It was not without extreme reluctance that they pronounced a sentence of acquittal; but they eagerly admitted such evidence as was stained with perjury, or procured by torture, to prove the most improbable charges against the most respectable characters. The progress of the inquiry continually opened new subjects of criminal prosecution; the audacious informer, whose falsehood was detected, retired with impunity; but the wretched victim, who discovered his real, or pretended, accomplices, was seldom permitted to receive the price of his infamy. From the extremity of Italy and Asia, the young, and the aged, were dragged in chains to the tribunals of Rome and Antioch. Senators, matrons, and philosophers, expired in ignominious and cruel tortures. The soldiers, who were appointed to guard the prisons, declared, with a murmur of pity and indignation, that their

bitur semper et retinebitur. Tacit. Hist. i. 22. August. de Civit. Dei, l. viii. c. 19. and the Theod. Code, l. ix. tit. xvi. with Godefroy.

[1] The persecution of Antioch was occasioned by a criminal consultation. The twenty-four letters of the alphabet were arranged round a magic tripod; and a dancing ring, which had been placed in the centre, pointed to the four first letters in the name of the future emperor, Θ. Ε. Ο. Δ. Theodorus (perhaps with many others who owned the fatal syllables) was executed. Theodosius succeeded. Lardner (Heath. Testim. iv. 353.) has copiously and fairly examined this dark transaction of the reign of Valens.

[2] Limus ut hic durescit, et hæc ut cera liquescit
Uno eodemque igni—— Virgil. Bucolic. viii. 80.

Devovit absentes, simulacraque cerea figit.
Ovid. in Epist. Hypsil. ad Jason. 91.

Such vain incantations could affect the mind, and increase the disease, of Germanicus. Tacit Annal. ii. 69.

[3] Heineccius Antiquitat. Juris Roman. ii. p. 353, &c. Cod. Theodosian. l. ix. tit. 7, with Godefroy's Com.

numbers were insufficient to oppose the flight, or resistance, of the multitude of captives. The wealthiest families were ruined by fines and confiscations ; the most innocent citizens trembled for their safety; and we may form some notion of the magnitude of the evil, from the extravagant assertion of an ancient writer, that, in the obnoxious provinces, the prisoners, the exiles, and the fugitives, formed the greatest part of the inhabitants.[1]

When Tacitus describes the deaths of the innocent and illustrious Romans, who were sacrificed to the cruelty of the first Cæsars, the art of the historian, or the merit of the sufferers, excite in our breasts the most lively sensations of terror, of admiration, and of pity. The coarse and undistinguishing pencil of Ammianus has delineated his bloody figures with tedious and disgusting accuracy. But as our attention is no longer engaged by the contrast of freedom and servitude, of recent greatness and of actual misery, we should turn with horror from the frequent executions, which disgraced, both at Rome and Antioch, the reign (A.D. 364—375) of the two brothers.[2] Valens was of a timid,[3] and Valentinian of a choleric, disposition.[4] An anxious regard to his personal safety was the ruling principle of the administration of Valens. In the condition of a subject, he had kissed, with trembling awe, the hand of the oppressor : and when he ascended the throne, he reasonably expected, that the same fears, which had subdued his own mind, would secure the patient submission of his people. The favourites of Valens obtained, by the privilege of rapine and confiscation, the wealth which his economy would have refused.[5] They urged, with persuasive eloquence, *that*, in all cases of treason, suspicion is equivalent to proof; *that* the power supposes the intention of mischief; *that* the intention is not less criminal than the act ; and *that* a subject no longer deserves to live, if his life may threaten the safety, or disturb the repose, of his sovereign. The judgment of Valentinian was sometimes deceived, and his confidence abused ; but he would have silenced the informers with a contemptuous smile, had they presumed to alarm his fortitude by the sound of danger. They praised his inflexible love of justice ; and, in the pursuit of justice, the emperor was easily tempted to consider clemency as a weakness, and passion as a virtue. As long as he wrestled with his equals, in the bold competition of an active and ambitious life, Valentinian was sel-

[1] The cruel persecution of Rome and Antioch is described, and most probably exaggerated, by Ammian. (xxviii. 1. xxix. 1, 2.) and Zos. (l. iv. 216.). The philosopher Maximus, with some justice, was involved in the charge of magic (Eunap. in Vit. Sophist. p. 88.); and young Chrysostom, who had accidentally found one of the proscribed books, gave himself for lost (Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 340.).

[2] Consult the six last books of Ammianus, and more particularly the portraits of the two royal brothers (xxx. 8, 9. xxxi. 14.). Tillemont has collected (v. p. 12. 127.) from all antiquity their virtues and vices.

[3] The younger Victor asserts, that he was valde timidus : yet he behaved, as almost every man would do, with decent resolution at the *head* of an army. The same historian attempts to prove, that his anger was harmless. Ammianus observes with more candour and judgment, incidentia crimina ad contemptam vel læsam principis amplitudinem trahens, in sanguinem sæviebat.

[4] Cum esset ad acerbitatem naturæ calore propensior . . . pœnas per ignes augebat et gladios. Ammian. xxx. 8. xxvii. 7.

[5] I have transferred the reproach of avarice from Valens to his servants. Avarice more properly belongs to ministers than to kings; in whom that passion is commonly extinguished by absolute possession.

dom injured, and never insulted, with impunity: if his prudence was arraigned, his spirit was applauded; and the proudest and most powerful generals were apprehensive of provoking the resentment of a fearless soldier. After he became master of the world, he unfortunately forgot, that where no resistance can be made, no courage can be exerted; and instead of consulting the dictates of reason and magnanimity, he indulged the furious emotions of his temper, at a time when they were disgraceful to himself, and fatal to the defenceless objects of his displeasure. In the government of his household, or of his empire, slight, or even imaginary, offences; a hasty word, a casual omission, an involuntary delay; were chastised by a sentence of immediate death. The expressions which issued the most readily from the mouth of the emperor of the West were, "Strike off his head;" "burn him alive;" "let him be beaten with clubs till he expires;"[1] and his most favoured ministers soon understood, that, by a rash attempt to dispute, or suspend, the execution of his sanguinary commands, they might involve themselves in the guilt and punishment of disobedience. The repeated gratification of this savage justice hardened the mind of Valentinian against pity and remorse; and the sallies of passion were confirmed by the habits of cruelty.[2] He could behold with calm satisfaction the convulsive agonies of torture and death: he reserved his friendship for those faithful servants whose temper was the most congenial to his own. The merit of Maximin, who had slaughtered the noblest families of Rome, was rewarded with the royal approbation, and the præfecture of Gaul. Two fierce and enormous bears, distinguished by the appellations of *Innocence* and *Mica Aurea*, could alone deserve to share the favour of Maximin. The cages of those trusty guards were always placed near the bed-chamber of Valentinian, who frequently amused his eyes with the grateful spectacle of seeing them tear and devour the bleeding limbs of the malefactors, who were abandoned to their rage. Their diet and exercises were carefully inspected by the Roman emperor; and when *Innocence* had earned her discharge, by a long course of meritorious service, the faithful animal was again restored to the freedom of her native woods.[3]

But in the calmer moments of reflection, when the mind of Valens was not agitated by fear, or that of Valentinian by rage, the tyrant resumed the sentiments, or at least the conduct, of the father of his country. The dispassionate judgment of the Western emperor could clearly perceive, and accurately pursue, his own and the public interest; and the sovereign of the East, who imitated with equal docility the various examples which he received from his elder brother, was sometimes guided by the wisdom and virtue of the præfect Sallust. Both princes invariably retained, in the purple, the chaste and temperate

[1] He sometimes expressed a sentence of death with a tone of pleasantry; "Abi, Comes, et "muta ei caput, qui sibi mutari provinciam cupit." A boy, who had slipped too hastily a Spartan hound; an armourer, who had made a polished cuirass that wanted some grains of the legitimate weight, &c. were the victims of his fury.

[2] The innocents of Milan were an agent and three apparitors, whom Valentinian condemned for signifying a legal summons. Ammian. (xxvii. 7.) strangely supposes, that all who had been unjustly executed were worshipped as martyrs by the Christians. His impartial silence does not allow us to believe, that the great chamberlain Rhodanus was burnt alive for an act of oppression (Chron. Paschal. p. 302.).

[3] Ut bene meritam in sylvas jussit abire *Innoxiam*. Ammian. xxix. 3. and Valesius ad loc

simplicity which had adorned their private life; and, under their reign, the pleasures of the court never cost the people a blush or a sigh. They gradually reformed many of the abuses of the times of Constantius; judiciously adopted and improved the designs of Julian and his successor; and displayed a style and spirit of legislation which might inspire posterity with the most favourable opinion of their character and government. It is not from the master of *Innocence*, that we should expect the tender regard for the welfare of his subjects, which prompted Valentinian to condemn the exposition of new-born infants;[1] and to establish fourteen skilful physicians, with stipends and privileges, in the fourteen quarters of Rome. The good sense of an illiterate soldier founded an useful and liberal institution for the education of youth, and the support of declining science.[2] It was his intention, that the arts of rhetoric and grammar should be taught, in the Greek and Latin languages, in the metropolis of every province; and as the size and dignity of the school was usually proportioned to the importance of the city, the academies of Rome and Constantinople claimed a just and singular pre-eminence. The fragments of the literary edicts of Valentinian imperfectly represent the school of Constantinople, which was gradually improved by subsequent regulations. That school consisted of thirty-one professors in different branches of learning. One philosopher, and two lawyers; five sophists, and ten grammarians for the Greek, and three orators, and ten grammarians for the Latin, tongue; besides seven scribes, or, as they were then styled, antiquarians, whose laborious pens supplied the public library with fair and correct copies of the classic writers. The rule of conduct, which was prescribed to the students, is the more curious, as it affords the first outlines of the form and discipline of a modern university. It was required, that they should bring proper certificates from the magistrates of their native province. Their names, professions, and places of abode, were regularly entered in a public register. The studious youth were severely prohibited from wasting their time in feasts, or in the theatre; and the term of their education was limited to the age of twenty. The præfect of the city was empowered to chastise the idle and refractory, by stripes or expulsion; and he was directed to make an annual report to the master of the offices, that the knowledge and abilities of the scholars might be usefully applied to the public service. The institutions of Valentinian contributed to secure the benefits of peace and plenty: and the cities were guarded by the establishment of the *Defensors*;[3] freely elected as the tribunes and advocates of the people, to support their rights, and to expose their grievances, before the tribunals of the civil magistrates, or even

[1] Justinian's Code, l. viii. tit. lii. leg. 2. Unusquisque sobolem suam nutriat. Quod si exponendam putaverit animadversioni quæ constituta est subjacebit. For the present I shall not interfere in the dispute between Noodt and Binkershoek; how far, or how long, this unnatural practice had been condemned or abolished by law, philosophy, and the more civilized state of society.

[2] These salutary institutions are explained in the Theod. Code, l. xiii. tit. iii. *De Professoribus et Medicis*, and l. xiv. tit. ix. *De Studiis liberalibus Urbis Romæ*. Besides our usual guide (Godefroy), we may consult Gianone (Istor. di Napoli, i. 105.), who has treated the interesting subject with the zeal and curiosity of a man of letters, who studies his domestic history.

[3] Cod. Theod. l. i. tit. xi. with Godefroy's *Paratitlon*, which diligently gleans from the est of the code.

at the foot of the Imperial throne. The finances were diligently administered by two princes, who had been so long accustomed to the rigid economy of a private fortune; but in the receipt and application of the revenue, a discerning eye might observe some difference between the government of the East and of the West. Valens was persuaded, that royal liberality can be supplied only by public oppression, and his ambition never aspired to secure, by their actual distress, the future strength and prosperity of his people. Instead of increasing the weight of taxes, which, in the space of forty years, had been gradually doubled, he reduced, in the first years of his reign, one-fourth of the tribute of the East.[1] Valentinian appears to have been less attentive and less anxious to relieve the burthens of his people. He might reform the abuses of the fiscal administration; but he exacted, without scruple, a very large share of the private property; as he was convinced, that the revenues which supported the luxury of individuals, would be much more advantageously employed for the defence and improvement of the state. The subjects of the East, who enjoyed the present benefit, applauded the indulgence of their prince. The solid but less splendid, merit of Valentinian was felt and acknowledged by the subsequent generation.[2]

But the most honourable circumstance of the character of Valentinian, is the firm and temperate impartiality which he (A.D. 364—375) uniformly preserved in an age of religious contention. His strong sense, unenlightened, but uncorrupted, by study, declined, with respectful indifference, the subtle questions of theological debate. The government of the *Earth* claimed his vigilance, and satisfied his ambition; and while he remembered that he was the disciple of the church, he never forgot that he was the sovereign of the clergy. Under the reign of an apostate, he had signalized his zeal for the honour of Christianity: he allowed to his subjects the privilege which he had assumed for himself; and they might accept, with gratitude and confidence, the general toleration which was granted by a prince, addicted to passion, but incapable of fear or of disguise.[3] The Pagans, the Jews, and all the various sects which acknowledged the divine authority of Christ, were protected by the laws from arbitrary power or popular insult; nor was any mode of worship prohibited by Valentinian, except those secret and criminal practices, which abused the name of religion for the dark purposes of vice and disorder. The art of magic, as it was more cruelly punished, was more strictly proscribed; but the emperor admitted a formal distinction to protect the ancient methods of divination, which were approved by the senate, and exercised by the Tuscan haruspices. He had condemned, with the consent

[1] Three lines from Ammian. (xxxi. 14.) countenance a whole oration of Themist. (viii. 101.), full of adulation, pedantry, and common-place morality. The eloquent M. Thomas (i. 366.) has amused himself with celebrating the virtues and genius of Themistius, who was not unworthy of the age in which he lived.

[2] Zos. l. iv. 202. Ammian. xxx. 9. His reformation of costly abuses might entitle him to the praise of, in provinciales admodum parcus, tributorum ubique molliens sarcinas. By some his frugality was styled avarice (Jerom. Chron. p. 186.).

[3] Testes sunt leges a me in exordio Imperii mei datæ: quibus unicuique quod animo imbibisset colendi libera facultas tributa est. Cod. Theod. l. ix. tit. xvi. leg. 9. To this declaration of Valentinian, we may add the various testimonies of Ammian. (xxx. 9.), Zos. (l. iv. 204.), and Soz. (l. vi. c. 7. 21.). Baronius would naturally blame such rational toleration (Annal. Eccles. A.D. 370. No. 129—132. A.D. 376. No. 3, 4.).

of the most rational Pagans, the licence of nocturnal sacrifices; but he immediately admitted the petition of Prætextatus, proconsul of Achaia, who represented, that the life of the Greeks would become dreary and comfortless, if they were deprived of the invaluable blessing of the Eleusinian mysteries. Philosophy alone can boast (and perhaps it is no more than the boast of philosophy), that her gentle hand is able to eradicate from the human mind the latent and deadly principle of fanaticism. But this truce of twelve years, which was enforced by the wise and vigorous government of Valentinian, by suspending the repetition of mutual injuries, contributed to soften the manners, and abate the prejudices, of the religious factions.

The friend of toleration was unfortunately placed at a distance from the scene of the fiercest controversies. As soon as the Christians of the West had extricated themselves from the snares of the creed of Rimini, they (A.D. 367—378) happily relapsed into the slumber of orthodoxy; and the small remains of the Arian party, that still subsisted at Sirmium or Milan, might be considered, rather as objects of contempt than of resentment. But in the provinces of the East, from the Euxine to the extremity of Thebais, the strength and numbers of the hostile factions were more equally balanced; and this equality, instead of recommending the counsels of peace, served only to perpetuate the horrors of religious war. The monks and bishops supported their arguments by invectives; and their invectives were sometimes followed by blows. Athanasius still reigned at Alexandria; the thrones of Constantinople and Antioch were occupied by Arian prelates, and every episcopal vacancy was the occasion of a popular tumult. The Homoousians were fortified by the reconciliation of fifty-nine Macedonian, or Semi-Arian, bishops; but their secret reluctance to embrace the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, clouded the splendour of the triumph: and the declaration of Valens, who, in the first years of his reign, had imitated the impartial conduct of his brother, was an important victory on the side of Arianism. The two brothers had passed their private life in the condition of catechumens; but the piety of Valens prompted him to solicit the sacrament of baptism, before he exposed his person to the dangers of a Gothic war. He naturally addressed himself to Eudoxus,[1] bishop of the Imperial city; and if the ignorant monarch was instructed by that Arian pastor in the principles of heterodox theology, his misfortune, rather than his guilt, was the inevitable consequence of his erroneous choice. Whatever had been the determination of the emperor, he must have offended a numerous party of his Christian subjects; as the leaders both of the Homoousians and of the Arians believed, that, if they were not suffered to reign, they were most cruelly injured and oppressed. After he had taken this decisive step, it was extremely difficult for him to preserve either the virtue, or the reputation, of impartiality. He never aspired, like Constantius, to the fame of a profound theologian; but, as he had received with simplicity and respect the tenets of Eudoxus, Valens resigned

[1] Eudoxus was of a mild and timid disposition. When he baptized Valens (A.D. 367.) he must have been extremely old; since he had studied theology fifty-five years before, under Lucian, a learned and pious martyr. Philostorg. l. ii. c. 14—16. l. iv. c. 4. with Godefroy, p. 82. 206 and Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. v. 474.

his conscience to the direction of his ecclesiastical guides, and promoted, by the influence of his authority, the re-union of the *Athanasian heretics* to the body of the catholic church. At first, he pitied their blindness; by degrees he was provoked at their obstinacy; and he insensibly hated those sectaries to whom he was an object of hatred.[1] The feeble mind of Valens was always swayed by the persons with whom he familiarly conversed; and the exile or imprisonment of a private citizen are the favours the most readily granted in a despotic court. Such punishments were frequently inflicted on the leaders of the Homoousian party; and the misfortune of fourscore ecclesiastics of Constantinople, who, perhaps accidentally, were burnt on shipboard, was imputed to the cruel and premeditated malice of the emperor and his Arian ministers. In every contest, the Catholics (if we may anticipate that name) were obliged to pay the penalty of their own faults, and of those of their adversaries. In every election, the claims of the Arian candidate obtained the preference; and if they were opposed by the majority of the people, he was usually supported by the authority of the civil magistrate, or even by the terrors of a military force. The enemies of Athanasius attempted to disturb the last years of his venerable age; and his temporary retreat to his father's sepulchre has been celebrated as a fifth exile. But the zeal of a great people, who instantly flew to arms, intimidated the præfect; and the archbishop was permitted to end his life in peace and in glory, after a reign of forty-seven years. The death of Athanasius (A.D. 373. May 2) was the signal of the persecution of Egypt; and the Pagan minister of Valens, who forcibly seated the worthless Lucius on the archiepiscopal throne, purchased the favour of the reigning party by the blood and sufferings of their Christian brethren. The free toleration of the heathen and Jewish worship was bitterly lamented, as a circumstance which aggravated the misery of the Catholics, and the guilt of the impious tyrant of the East.[2]

The triumph of the orthodox party has left a deep stain of persecution on the memory of Valens; and the character of a prince who derived his virtues, as well as his vices, from a feeble understanding, and a pusillanimous temper, scarcely deserves the labour of an apology. Yet candour may discover some reasons to suspect, that the ecclesiastical ministers of Valens often exceeded the orders, or even the intentions, of their master; and that the real measure of facts has been very liberally magnified by the vehement declamation and easy credulity of his antagonists.[3] 1. The silence of Valentinian may suggest a probable argument, that the partial severities, which were exercised in the name and provinces of his colleague, amounted only to some obscure and inconsiderable deviations from the established system of religious toleration: and the judicious historian, who has praised the equal temper of the elder brother, has not thought himself obliged to contrast the tranquillity of the West with the cruel persecution of the

[1] Greg. Naz. (Orat. xxv. 432.) insults the persecuting spirit of the Arians, as an infallible symptom of error and heresy.

[2] This sketch of the ecclesiastical government of Valens is drawn from Socr. (l. iv.), Soz. (l. vi.), Theod. (l. iv.), and the immense compilations of Tillemont (vi. viii. and ix.).

[3] Jortin (Remarks on Eccles. Hist. vol. iv. 78.) has already conceived and intimated the same suspicion.

East.[1] 2. Whatever credit may be allowed to vague and distant reports, the character, or at least the behaviour, of Valens may be most distinctly seen in his personal transactions with the eloquent Basil, archbishop of Cæsarea, who had succeeded Athanasius in the management of the Trinitarian cause.[2] The circumstantial narrative has been composed by the friends and admirers of Basil; and as soon as we have stripped away a thick coat of rhetoric and miracle, we shall be astonished by the unexpected mildness of the Arian tyrant, who admired the firmness of his character, or was apprehensive, if he employed violence, of a general revolt in the province of Cappadocia. The archbishop, who asserted, with inflexible pride,[3] the truth of his opinions, and the dignity of his rank, was left in the free possession of his conscience, and his throne. The emperor devoutly assisted at the solemn service of the cathedral; and, instead of a sentence of banishment, subscribed the donation of a valuable estate for the use of an hospital, which Basil had lately founded in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea.[4] 3. I am not able to discover, that any law (such as Theodosius afterwards enacted against the Arians) was published by Valens against the Athanasian sectaries; and the edict which excited the most violent clamours, may not appear so extremely reprehensible. The emperor had observed, that several of his subjects, gratifying their lazy disposition under the pretence of religion, had associated themselves with the monks of Egypt; and he directed the count of the East to drag them from their solitude; and to compel those deserters of society to accept the fair alternative, of renouncing their temporal possessions, or of discharging the public duties of men and citizens.[5] The ministers of Valens seem to have extended the sense of this penal statute, since they claimed a right of enlisting the young and able-bodied monks in the Imperial armies. A detachment of cavalry and infantry, consisting of 3000 men, marched from Alexandria into the adjacent desert of Nitria,[6] which was peopled by 5000 monks. The soldiers were conducted by Arian priests; and it is reported, that a considerable slaughter was made in the monasteries which disobeyed the commands of their sovereign.[7]

[1] This reflection is so obvious and forcible, that Oros. (l. vii. c.32, 33.) delays the persecution till after the death of Valentinian. Socrates, on the other hand, supposes (l. iii. c. 32.), that it was appeased by a philosophical oration, which Themistius pronounced in the year 374 (Orat. xii. 154. in Latin only). Such contradictions diminish the evidence, and reduce the term, of the persecution of Valens.

[2] Tillemont, whom I follow and abridge, has extracted (Mem. Eccles. viii. 153.) the most authentic circumstances from the Panegyrics of the two Gregories; the brother, and the friend, of Basil. The letters of Basil himself (Dupin, Biblio. Eccles. ii. 155.) do not present the image of a very lively persecution.

[3] Basilius Cæsariensis episcopus Cappadociæ clarus habetur . . . . qui multa continentiæ et ingenii bona uno superbiæ malo perdidit. This irreverent passage is perfectly in the style and character of St. Jerom. It does not appear in Scaliger's edition of his Chronicle; but Isaac Vossius found it in some old MSS. which had not been reformed by the monks.

[4] This noble and charitable foundation (almost a new city) surpassed in merit, if not in greatness, the pyramids, or the walls of Babylon. It was principally intended for the reception of lepers (Greg. Naz. Orat. xx. 439.).

[5] Cod. Theod. l. xii. tit. i. leg. 63. Godefroy (iv. 409.) performs the duty of a commentator and advocate. Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. viii. 808.) *supposes* a second law to excuse his orthodox friends, who had misrepresented the edict of Valens, and suppressed the liberty of choice.

[6] D'Anville, Description de l'Egypte, p. 74. Hereafter I shall consider the monastic institutions.

[7] Socr. l. iv. c. 24, 25. Oros. l. vii. c. 33. Jerom in Chron. p 189. and ii. 212. The monks

The strict regulations which have been framed by the wisdom of modern legislators to restrain the wealth and avarice of the clergy, may be originally deduced from the example of the emperor Valentinian. His edict[1] (A.D. 370) addressed to Damasus, bishop of Rome, was publicly read in the churches of the city. He admonished the ecclesiastics and monks not to frequent the houses of widows and virgins; and menaced their disobedience with the animadversion of the civil judge. The director was no longer permitted to receive any gift, or legacy, or inheritance, from the liberality of his spiritual daughter: every testament contrary to this edict was declared null and void; and the illegal donation was confiscated for the use of the treasury. By a subsequent regulation, it should seem, that the same provisions were extended to nuns and bishops; and that all persons of the ecclesiastical order were rendered incapable of receiving any testamentary gifts, and strictly confined to the natural and legal rights of inheritance. As the guardian of domestic happiness and virtue, Valentinian applied this severe remedy to the growing evil. In the capital of the empire, the females of noble and opulent houses possessed a very ample share of independent property: and many of those devout females had embraced the doctrines of Christianity, not only with the cold assent of the understanding, but with the warmth of affection, and perhaps with the eagerness of fashion. They sacrificed the pleasures of dress and luxury; and renounced, for the praise of chastity, the soft endearments of conjugal society. Some ecclesiastic, of real or apparent sanctity, was chosen to direct their timorous conscience, and to amuse the vacant tenderness of their heart: and the unbounded confidence, which they hastily bestowed, was often abused by knaves and enthusiasts; who hastened from the extremities of the East, to enjoy, on a splendid theatre, the privileges of the monastic profession. By their contempt of the world, they insensibly acquired its most desirable advantages; the lively attachment, perhaps, of a young and beautiful woman, the delicate plenty of an opulent household, and the respectful homage of the slaves, the freedmen, and the clients of a senatorial family. The immense fortunes of the Roman ladies were gradually consumed, in lavish alms and expensive pilgrimages; and the artful monk, who had assigned himself the first, or possibly the sole place, in the testament of his spiritual daughter, still presumed to declare, with the smooth face of hypocrisy, that *he* was only the instrument of charity, and the steward of the poor. The lucrative, but disgraceful, trade,[2] which was exercised by the clergy to defraud the expectations of the natural heirs, had provoked the indignation of a superstitious age: and two of the most respectable of the Latin fathers very honestly confess, that the

of Egypt performed many miracles, which prove the truth of their faith. Right, says Jortin (Remarks, iv. 79.), but what proves the truth of those miracles?

[1] Cod. Theod. l. xvi. tit. ii. leg. 20. Godefroy (vi. 49.), after the example of Baronius, impartially collects all that the fathers have said on the subject of this important law; whose spirit was long afterwards revived by the emperor Frederic II., Edward I. of England, and other Christian princes who reigned after the twelfth century.

[2] The expressions which I have used are temperate and feeble, if compared with the vehement invectives of Jerom (i. 13. 45. 144.). In *his* turn, he was reproached with the guilt which he imputed to his brother monks: and the *Sceleratus*, the *Versipellis*, was publicly accused as the lover of the widow Paula (ii. 363.). He undoubtedly possessed the affections, both of the mother and the daughter; but he declares that he never abused his influence to any selfish or sensual purpose.

ignominious edict of Valentinian was just and necessary; and that the Christian priests had deserved to lose a privilege, which was still enjoyed by comedians, charioteers, and the ministers of idols. But the wisdom and authority of the legislator are seldom victorious in a contest with the vigilant dexterity of private interest: and Jerom, or Ambrose, might patiently acquiesce in the justice of an ineffectual or salutary law. If the ecclesiastics were checked in the pursuit of personal emolument, they would exert a more laudable industry to increase the wealth of the church; and dignify their covetousness with the specious names of piety and patriotism.[1]

Damasus, bishop of Rome, who was constrained to stigmatize the avarice of his clergy by the publication of the law of Valentinian, had the good sense, or the good fortune, to engage in his service the zeal and abilities of the learned Jerom; and the grateful saint has celebrated the merit and purity of a very ambiguous character.[2] But the splendid vices of the Church of Rome, under the reign of Valentinian and Damasus (A.D. 366—384), have been curiously observed by the historian Ammianus, who delivers his impartial sense in these expressive words: "The præfecture of Juventius was accompanied with "peace and plenty: but the tranquillity of his government was soon disturbed by a bloody sedition of the distracted people. The ardour "of Damasus and Ursinus, to seize the episcopal seat, surpassed the "ordinary measure of human ambition. They contended with the rage "of party; the quarrel was maintained by the wounds and death of "their followers; and the præfect, unable to resist or to appease the "tumult, was constrained, by superior violence, to retire into the "suburbs. Damasus prevailed: the well-disputed victory remained "on the side of his faction; 137 dead bodies[3] were found in the "*Basilica* of Sicininus,[4] where the Christians hold their religious "assemblies; and it was long before the angry minds of the people "resumed their accustomed tranquillity. When I consider the splendour of the capital, I am not astonished that so valuable a prize "should inflame the desires of ambitious men, and produce the fiercest "and most obstinate contests. The successful candidate is secure, "that he will be enriched by the offerings of matrons;[5] that, as soon "as his dress is composed with becoming care and elegance, he may "proceed, in his chariot, through the streets of Rome;[6] and, that the

[1] Pudet dicere, sacerdotes idolorum, mimi et aurigæ, et scorta, hæreditates capiunt: solis *clericis* ac *monachis* hâc lege prohibetur. Et non prohibetur a persecutoribus, sed a principibus Christianis. Nec de lege queror; sed doleo cur *meruerimus* hanc legem. Jerom (i. 13.) discreetly insinuates the secret policy of his patron Damasus.

[2] Three words of Jerom, *sanctæ memoriæ Damasus* (ii. 109.), wash away all his stains; and blind the devout eyes of Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. viii. 386.).

[3] Jerom himself is forced to allow, crudelissimæ interfectiones diversi sexûs perpetratæ (in Chron. p. 186.). But an original *libel* or petition of two presbyters of the adverse party, has unaccountably escaped. They affirm, that the doors of the Basilica were burnt, and that the roof was untiled; that Damasus marched at the head of his own clergy, grave-diggers, charioteers, and hired gladiators; that none of *his* party were killed, but that 160 dead bodies were found. This petition is published by the P. Sirmond, in the first volume of his works.

[4] The *Basilica* of Sicininus, or Liberius, is probably the church of Sta. Maria Maggiore, on the Esquiline hill. Baronius, A.D. 367. No. 3.; and Donatus, Roma Antiqua et Nova, l. iv. c 3. 462

[5] The enemies of Damasus styled him *Auriscalpius Matronarum*, the ladies' ear-scratcher.

[6] Greg. Naz. (Orat xxxii. 526.) describes the pride and luxury of the prelates, who reigned

"sumptuousness of the Imperial table will not equal the profuse and "delicate entertainments provided by the taste, and at the expence, of "the Roman pontiffs. How much more rationally," continues the honest Pagan, "would those pontiffs consult their true happiness, if, "instead of alleging the greatness of the city as an excuse for their "manners, they would imitate the exemplary life of some provincial "bishops, whose temperance and sobriety, whose mean apparel and "downcast looks, recommended their pure and modest virtue to the "Deity, and his true worshippers."[1] The schism of Damasus and Ursinus was extinguished by the exile of the latter; and the wisdom of the præfect Prætextatus[2] restored the tranquillity of the city. Prætextatus was a philosophic Pagan, a man of learning, of taste, and politeness; who disguised a reproach in the form of a jest, when he assured Damasus, that if he could obtain the bishopric of Rome, he himself would immediately embrace the Christian religion.[3] This lively picture of the wealth and luxury of the popes in the fourth century, becomes the more curious, as it represents the intermediate degree, between the humble poverty of the apostolic fisherman, and the royal state of a temporal prince, whose dominions extend from the confines of Naples to the banks of the Po.

When the suffrage of the generals and of the army committed (A.D. 364—375) the sceptre of the Roman empire to the hands of Valentinian, his reputation in arms, his military skill and experience, and his rigid attachment to the forms, as well as spirit, of ancient discipline, were the principal motives of their judicious choice. The eagerness of the troops who pressed him to nominate his colleague was justified by the dangerous situation of public affairs; and Valentinian himself was conscious, that the abilities of the most active mind were unequal to the defence of the distant frontiers of an invaded monarchy. As soon as the death of Julian had relieved the Barbarians from the terror of his name, the most sanguine hopes of rapine and conquest excited the nations of the East, of the North, and of the South. Their inroads were often vexatious, and sometimes formidable; but, during the twelve years (A.D. 364—375) of the reign of Valentinian, his firmness and vigilance protected his own dominions; and his powerful genius seemed to inspire and direct the feeble counsels of his brother. Perhaps the method of annals would more forcibly express the urgent and divided cares of the two emperors; but the attention of the reader, likewise, would be distracted by a tedious and desultory narrative. A separate view of the five great theatres of war; I. Germany; II.

in the Imperial cities; their gilt car, fiery steeds, numerous train, &c. The crowd gave way as to a wild beast.

[1] Ammian. xxvii. 3. Perpetuo Numini, *verisque* ejus cultoribus. The incomparable pliancy of a Polytheist!

[2] Ammianus, who makes a fair report of his præfecture (xxvii. 9.), styles him præclaræ indolis, gravitatisque, senator (xxii. 7. and Vales. ad loc.). A curious incription (Gruter MCII. No. 2.) records, in two columns, his religious and civil honours. In one line he was Pontiff of the Sun and of Vesta, Augur, Quindecemvir, Hierophant, &c. &c. In the other, 1. Quæstor candidatus, more probably titular. 2. Prætor. 3. Corrector of Tuscany and Umbria. 4. Consular of Lusitania. 5. Proconsul of Achaia. 6. Præfect of Rome. 7. Prætorian præfect of Italy. 8. Of Illyricum. 9. Consul elect; but he died before the beginning of the year 385. Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 241. 736.

[3] Facite me Romanæ urbis episcopum; et ero protinus Christianus (Jerom, tom. ii. 165.). It is more than probable, that Damasus would not have purchased his conversion at such a price.

Britain; III. Africa; IV. The East; and, V. The Danube; will impress a more distinct image of the military state of the empire under the reigns of Valentinian and Valens.

I. The ambassadors of the Alemanni had been (A.D. 365) offended by the harsh and haughty behaviour of Ursacius, master of the offices;[1] who, by an act of unseasonable parsimony, had diminished the value, as well as the quantity, of the presents, to which they were entitled, either from custom or treaty, on the accession of a new emperor. They expressed, and they communicated to their countrymen, their strong sense of the national affront. The irascible minds of the chiefs were exasperated by the suspicion of contempt; and the martial youth crowded to their standard. Before Valentinian could pass the Alps, the villages of Gaul were in flames; before his general Dagalaiphus could encounter the Alemanni, they had secured the captives and the spoil in the forests of Germany. In the beginning of the ensuing year (A.D. 366. Jan.), the military force of the whole nation, in deep and solid columns, broke through the barrier of the Rhine, during the severity of a northern winter. Two Roman counts were defeated and mortally wounded; and the standard of the Heruli and Batavians fell into the hands of the conquerors, who displayed, with insulting shouts and menaces, the trophy of their victory. The standard was recovered; but the Batavians had not redeemed the shame of their disgrace and flight in the eyes of their severe judge. It was the opinion of Valentinian, that his soldiers must learn to fear their commander before they could cease to fear the enemy. The troops were solemnly assembled: and the trembling Batavians were inclosed within the circle of the Imperial army. Valentinian then ascended his tribunal: and, as if he disdained to punish cowardice with death, he inflicted a stain of indelible ignominy on the officers, whose misconduct and pusillanimity were found to be the first occasion of the defeat. The Batavians were degraded from their rank, stripped of their arms, and condemned to be sold for slaves to the highest bidder. At this tremendous sentence the troops fell prostrate on the ground; deprecated the indignation of their sovereign; and protested, that, if he would indulge them in another trial, they would approve themselves not unworthy of the name of Romans, and of his soldiers. Valentinian, with affected reluctance, yielded to their entreaties: the Batavians resumed their arms; and with their arms, the invincible resolution of wiping away their disgrace in the blood of the Alemanni.[2] The principal command was declined by Dagalaiphus; and that experienced general, who had represented, perhaps with too much prudence, the extreme difficulties of the undertaking, had the mortification, before the end of the campaign, of seeing his rival Jovinus convert those difficulties into a decisive advantage over the scattered forces of the Barbarians. At the head of a well-disciplined army of cavalry, infantry, and light troops, Jovinus advanced, with cautious and rapid steps, to Scarponna,[3]

[1] Ammian. xxvi. 5. Valesius adds a long and good note on the master of the offices.

[2] Ammian. xxvii. 1. Zos. l. iv. 208. The disgrace of the Batavians is suppressed by the contemporary soldier, from a regard for military honour, which could not affect a Greek rhetorician of the succeeding age.

[3] D'Anville, Not. de l'anc. Gaule, p. 587. The name of the Moselle, which is not specified by Ammianus, is clearly understood by Mascou (Hist. of the anc. Germ. vii. 2.).

in the territory of Metz, where he surprized a large division of the Alemanni, before they had time to run to their arms; and flushed his soldiers with the confidence of an easy and bloodless victory. Another division, or rather army, of the enemy, after the cruel and wanton devastation of the adjacent country, reposed themselves on the shady banks of the Moselle. Jovinus, who had viewed the ground with the eye of a general, made his silent approach through a deep and woody vale, till he could distinctly perceive the indolent security of the Germans. Some were bathing their huge limbs in the river; others were combing their long and flaxen hair; others again were swallowing large draughts of rich and delicious wine. On a sudden they heard the sound of the Roman trumpet; they saw the enemy in their camp. Astonishment produced disorder; disorder was followed by flight and dismay; and the confused multitude of the bravest warriors was pierced by the swords and javelins of the legionaries and auxiliaries. The fugitives escaped to the third, and most considerable, camp, in the Catalaunian plains, near Chalons in Champagne: the straggling detachments were hastily recalled to their standard; and the Barbarian chiefs, alarmed and admonished by the fate of their companions, prepared to encounter, in a decisive battle, the victorious forces of the lieutenant of Valentinian. The bloody and obstinate conflict lasted a whole summer's day, with equal valour, and with alternate success. The Romans at length prevailed, with the loss of about 1200 men. Six thousand of the Alemanni were slain, 4000 were wounded; and the brave Jovinus, after chasing the flying remnant of their host as far as the banks of the Rhine, returned to Paris, to receive (July) the applause of his sovereign, and the ensigns of the consulship for the ensuing year.[1] The triumph of the Romans was indeed sullied by their treatment of the captive king, whom they hung on a gibbet without the knowledge of their indignant general. This disgraceful act of cruelty, which might be imputed to the fury of the troops, was followed by the deliberate murder of Withicab, the son of Vadomair; a German prince, of a weak and sickly constitution, but of a daring and formidable spirit. The domestic assassin was instigated and protected by the Romans;[2] and the violation of the laws of humanity and justice betrayed their secret apprehension of the weakness of the declining empire. The use of the dagger is seldom adopted in public councils, as long as they retain any confidence in the power of the sword.

While the Alemanni appeared to be humbled by their recent calamities, the pride of Valentinian was mortified by the unexpected surprisal of Moguntiacum, or Mentz, the principal city of the Upper Germany. In the unsuspicious moment of a Christian festival, Rando, a bold and artful chieftain, who had long meditated his attempt (A.D. 368), suddenly passed the Rhine; entered the defenceless town, and retired with a multitude of captives of either sex. Valentinian resolved to execute severe vengeance on the whole body of the nation. Count Sebastian, with the bands of Italy and Illyricum, was ordered to invade their country, most probably on the side of Rhætia. The

[1] The battles are described by Ammianus (xxvii. 2.), and by Zosimus (l. iv. 209.); who supposes Valentinian to have been present.
[2] Studio solicitante nostrorum, occubuit. Ammian. xxvii. 10.

emperor in person, accompanied by his son Gratian, passed the Rhine at the head of a formidable army, which was supported on both flanks by Jovinus and Severus, the two masters-general of the cavalry and infantry of the West. The Alemanni, unable to prevent the devastation of their villages, fixed their camp on a lofty, and almost inaccessible, mountain, in the modern duchy of Wirtemberg, and resolutely expected the approach of the Romans. The life of Valentinian was exposed to imminent danger, by the intrepid curiosity with which he persisted to explore some secret and unguarded path. A troop of Barbarians suddenly rose from their ambuscade: and the emperor, who vigorously spurred his horse down a steep and slippery descent, was obliged to leave behind him his armour-bearer, and his helmet, magnificently enriched with gold and precious stones. At the signal of the general assault, the Roman troops encompassed and ascended the mountain of Solicinium on three different sides. Every step which they gained, increased their ardour, and abated the resistance of the enemy: and after their united forces had occupied the summit of the hill, they impetuously urged the Barbarians down the northern descent, where Count Sebastian was posted to intercept their retreat. After this signal victory, Valentinian returned to his winter-quarters at Treves; where he indulged the public joy by the exhibition of splendid and triumphal games.[1] But the wise monarch, instead of aspiring to the conquest of Germany, confined his attention to the important and laborious defence of the Gallic frontier, against an enemy, whose strength was renewed by a stream of daring volunteers, which incessantly flowed from the most distant tribes of the north.[2] The banks of the Rhine, from its source to the straits of the ocean, were closely planted with strong castles and convenient towers; new works and new arms were invented by the ingenuity of a prince who was skilled in the mechanical arts; and his numerous levies of Roman and Barbarian youth were severely trained in all the exercises of war. The progress of the work, which was sometimes opposed by modest representations, and sometimes by hostile attempts, secured the tranquillity of Gaul during the nine subsequent years of the administration of Valentinian.[3]

That prudent emperor, who diligently practised the wise maxims of Diocletian, was studious to foment and excite the intestine divisions of the tribes of Germany. About the middle of the fourth century (A.D. 371), the countries, perhaps of Lusace and Thuringia, on either side of the Elbe, were occupied by the vague dominion of the BURGUNDIANS; a warlike and numerous people of the Vandal race,[4] whose obscure name insensibly swelled into a powerful kingdom, and

[1] The expedition of Valentinian is related by Ammian. (xxvii. 10.); and celebrated by Ausonius (Mosell. 421.), who foolishly supposes, that the Romans were ignorant of the sources of the Danube.

[2] Immanis enim natio, jam inde ab incunabulis primis varietate casuum imminuta; ita sæpius adolescit, ut fuisse longis sæculis æstimetur intacta. Ammian. xxviii. 5. De Buat. (Hist. des Peup. de l'Europe, vi. 370.) ascribes the fecundity of the Alemanni to their easy adoption of strangers.

[3] Ammian. xxviii. 2. Zos. l. iv. 214. The younger Victor mentions the mechanical genius of Valentinian, nova arma meditari; fingere terrâ seu limo simulacra.

[4] Bellicosos et pubis immensæ viribus affluentes; et ideo metuendos finitionis universis. Ammian. xxviii. 5

has finally settled on a flourishing province. The most remarkable circumstance in the ancient manners of the Burgundians, appears to have been the difference of their civil and ecclesiastical constitution. The appellation of *Hendinos* was given to the king or general, and the title of *Sinistus* to the high-priest, of the nation. The person of the priest was sacred, and his dignity perpetual; but the temporal government was held by a very precarious tenure. If the events of war accused the courage or conduct of the king, he was immediately deposed; and the injustice of his subjects made him responsible for the fertility of the earth, and the regularity of the seasons, which seemed to fall more properly within the sacerdotal department.[1] The disputed possession of some salt-pits[2] engaged the Alemanni and the Burgundians in frequent contests: the latter were easily tempted, by the secret solicitations, and liberal offers, of the emperor; and their fabulous descent from the Roman soldiers, who had formerly been left to garrison the fortresses of Drusus, was admitted with mutual credulity, as it was conducive to mutual interest.[3] An army of 80,000 Burgundians soon appeared on the banks of the Rhine; and impatiently required the support and subsidies which Valentinian had promised: but they were amused with excuses and delays, till at length, after a fruitless expectation, they were compelled to retire. The arms and fortifications of the Gallic frontier checked the fury of their just resentment; and their massacre of the captives served to embitter the hereditary feud of the Burgundians and the Alemanni. The inconstancy of a wise prince may, perhaps, be explained by some alteration of circumstances; and, perhaps, it was the original design of Valentinian to intimidate, rather than to destroy; as the balance of power would have been equally overturned by the extirpation of either of the German nations. Among the princes of the Alemanni, Macrianus, who, with a Roman name, had assumed the arts of a soldier and a statesman, deserved his hatred and esteem. The emperor himself, with a light and unincumbered band, condescended to pass the Rhine, marched 50 miles into the country, and would infallibly have seized the object of his pursuit, if his judicious measures had not been defeated by the impatience of the troops. Macrianus was afterwards admitted to the honour of a personal conference with the emperor; and the favours which he received, fixed him, till the hour of his death, a steady and sincere friend of the republic.[4]

The land was covered by the fortifications of Valentinian; but the sea-coast of Gaul and Britain was exposed to the depredations of the

[1] I am always apt to suspect historians and travellers of improving extraordinary facts into general laws. Ammianus ascribes a similar custom to Egypt; and the Chinese have imputed it to the Tatsin, or Roman empire (de Guignes, Hist. des Huns, ii. part i. 79.).

[2] Salinarum finiumque causâ Alemannis sæpe jurgabant. Ammian. xxviii. 5. Possibly they disputed the possession of the *Sala*, a river which produced salt, and which had been the object of ancient contention. Tacit. Annal. xiii. 57., and Lipsius ad loc.

[3] Jam inde temporibus priscis sobolem se esse Romanam Burgundii sciunt: and the vague tradition gradually assumed a more regular form (Oros. l. vii. c. 32.). It is annihilated by the decisive authority of Pliny, who composed the history of Drusus, and served in Germany (Plin. Sec. Epist. iii. 5.), within sixty years after the death of that hero. *Germanorum genera* quinque; Vindili, quorum pars *Burgundiones*, &c. (Hist. Nat. iv. 28.).

[4] The wars and negociations, relative to the Burgundians and Alemanni, are distinctly related by Ammian. (xxviii. 5. xxix. 4. xxx. 3.). Oros. (l. vii. c. 32.), and the Chronicles of Jerom and Cassiodor. fix some dates, and add some circumstances.

Saxons. That celebrated name, in which we have a dear and domestic interest, escaped the notice of Tacitus: and in the maps of Ptolemy, it faintly marks the narrow neck of the Cimbric peninsula, and three small islands towards the mouth of the Elbe.[1] This contracted territory, the present Duchy of Sleswig, or perhaps of Holstein, was incapable of pouring forth the inexhaustible swarms of Saxons who reigned over the ocean, who filled the British island with their language, their laws, and their colonies; and who so long defended the liberty of the North against the arms of Charlemagne.[2] The solution of this difficulty is easily derived from the similar manners, and loose constitution, of the tribes of Germany; which were blended with each other by the slightest accidents of war or friendship. The situation of the native Saxons disposed them to embrace the hazardous professions of fishermen and pirates: and the success of their first adventures would naturally excite the emulation of their bravest countrymen, who were impatient of the gloomy solitude of their woods and mountains. Every tide might float down the Elbe whole fleets of canoes, filled with hardy and intrepid associates, who aspired to behold the unbounded prospect of the ocean, and to taste the wealth and luxury of unknown worlds. It should seem probable, however, that the most numerous auxiliaries of the Saxons were furnished by the nations who dwelt along the shores of the Baltic. They possessed arms and ships, the art of navigation, and the habits of naval war; but the difficulty of issuing through the northern columns of Hercules[3] (which, during several months of the year, are obstructed with ice) confined their skill and courage within the limits of a spacious lake. The rumour of the successful armaments which sailed from the mouth of the Elbe, would soon provoke them to cross the narrow isthmus of Sleswig, and to launch their vessels on the great sea. The various troops of pirates and adventurers, who fought under the same standard, were insensibly united in a permanent society, at first of rapine, and afterward of government. A military confederation was gradually moulded into a national body, by the gentle operation of marriage and consanguinity; and the adjacent tribes, who solicited the alliance, accepted the name and laws of the Saxons. If the fact were not established by the most unquestionable evidence, we should appear to abuse the credulity of our readers, by the description of the vessels in which the Saxon pirates ventured to sport in the waves of the German Ocean, the British Channel, and the Bay of Biscay. The keel of their large flat-bottomed boats was framed of light timber, but the sides and upper works consisted only of wicker, with a covering

[1] Επι τον αυχενα της Κιμβρικης χερσονησου Σαξονες. At the northern extremity of the peninsula (the Cimbric promontory of Pliny, iv. 27.), Ptolemy fixes the remnant of the *Cimbri.* He fills the interval between the *Saxons* and the Cimbri with six obscure tribes, who were united as early as the sixth century, under the national appellation of *Danes.* Cluver. Germ. Antiq. l. iii. c. 21, 22, 23.

[2] D'Anville (Etablissement des Etats de l'Eur. &c. p. 19.) has marked the extensive limits of the Saxony of Charlemagne.

[3] The fleet of Drusus had failed in their attempt to pass, or even to approach, the *Sound* (styled, from an obvious resemblance, the columns of Hercules); and the naval enterprize was never resumed (Tacit. de Mor. Germ. c. 34.). The knowledge which the Romans acquired of the naval powers of the Baltic (c. 44, 45.), was obtained by their land journeys in search of amber.

of strong hides.[1] In the course of their slow and distant navigations, they must always have been exposed to the danger, and very frequently to the misfortune, of shipwreck; and the naval annals of the Saxons were undoubtedly filled with the accounts of the losses, which they sustained on the coasts of Britain and Gaul. But the daring spirit of the pirates braved the perils, both of the sea and of the shore: their skill was confirmed by the habits of enterprize; the meanest of their mariners was alike capable of handling an oar, of rearing a sail, or of conducting a vessel; and the Saxons rejoiced in the appearance of a tempest, which concealed their design, and dispersed the fleets of the enemy.[2] After they had acquired an accurate knowledge of the maritime provinces of the West, they extended the scene of their depredations, and the most sequestered places had no reason to presume on their security. The Saxon boats drew so little water, that they could easily proceed 80 or 100 miles up the great rivers; their weight was so inconsiderable, that they were transported on waggons from one river to another; and the pirates who had entered the mouth of the Seine, or of the Rhine, might descend, with the rapid stream of the Rhone, into the Mediterranean. Under the reign of Valentinian (A.D. 371), the maritime provinces of Gaul were afflicted by the Saxons: a military count was stationed for the defence of the sea-coast, or Armorican limit; and that officer, who found his strength, or his abilities, unequal to the task, implored the assistance of Severus, master-general of the infantry. The Saxons, surrounded and out-numbered, were forced to relinquish their spoil, and to yield a select band of their tall and robust youth to serve in the Imperial armies. They stipulated only a safe and honourable retreat: and the condition was readily granted by the Roman general; who meditated an act of perfidy,[3] imprudent as it was inhuman, while a Saxon remained alive, and in arms, to revenge the fate of his countrymen. The premature eagerness of the infantry, who were secretly posted in a deep valley, betrayed the ambuscade; and they would perhaps have fallen the victims of their own treachery, if a large body of cuirassiers, alarmed by the noise of the combat, had not hastily advanced to extricate their companions, and to overwhelm the undaunted valour of the Saxons. Some of the prisoners were saved from the edge of the sword, to shed their blood in the amphitheatre: and the orator Symmachus complains, that twenty-nine of those desperate savages, by strangling themselves with their own hands, had disappointed the amusement of the public. Yet the polite and philosophic citizens of Rome were impressed with the deepest horror, when they were informed, that the Saxons consecrated to the gods the tythe of their

[1] Quin et Aremoricus piratam *Saxona* tractus,——
Sperabat; cui pelle salum sulcare Britannum
Ludus; et assuto glaucum mare findere lembo.
Sidon. in Paneg. Avit. 369.

The genius of Cæsar imitated, for a particular service, these rude, but light vessels, which were likewise used by the natives of Britain (Com. de Bell. Civil. i. 51. and Guichardt, Nouv. Mem. Milit. ii. 41.). The British vessels would now astonish the genius of Cæsar.

[2] The best original account of the Saxon pirates may be found in Sidonius Apollinaris (l. viii. epist. 6. p. 223. ed. Sirmond.), and the best commentary in Du Bos (Hist. Crit. de la Mon. Franc. i. l. i. c. 16. p. 148. and p. 77.).

[3] Ammian. (xxviii. 5.) justifies this breach of faith to pirates and robbers; and Oros. (l. vii. c. 32.) more clearly expresses their real guilt; virtute atque agilitate terribiles.

human spoil; and, that they ascertained by lot the objects of the barbarous sacrifice.[1]

II. The fabulous colonies of Egyptians and Trojans, of Scandinavians and Spaniards, which flattered the pride, and amused the credulity, of our rude ancestors, have insensibly vanished in the light of science and philosophy.[2] The present age is satisfied with the simple and rational opinion, that the islands of Great Britain and Ireland were gradually peopled from the adjacent continent of Gaul. From the coast of Kent, to the extremity of Caithness and Ulster, the memory of a Celtic origin was distinctly preserved, in the perpetual resemblance of language, of religion, and of manners: and the peculiar characters of the British tribes might be naturally ascribed to the influence of accidental and local circumstances.[3] The Roman province was reduced to the state of civilized and peaceful servitude: the rights of savage freedom were contracted to the narrow limits of Caledonia. The inhabitants of that northern region were divided, as early as the reign of Constantine, between the two great tribes of the SCOTS and of the PICTS,[4] who have since experienced a very different fortune. The power, and almost the memory, of the Picts, have been extinguished by their successful rivals; and the Scots, after maintaining for ages the dignity of an independent kingdom, have multiplied, by an equal and voluntary union, the honours of the English name. The hand of nature had contributed to mark the ancient distinction of the Scots and Picts. The former were the men of the hills, and the latter those of the plain. The eastern coast of Caledonia may be considered as a level and fertile country, which, even in a rude state of tillage, was capable of producing a considerable quantity of corn: and the epithet of *cruitnich*, or wheat-eaters, expressed the contempt, or envy, of the carnivorous highlander. The cultivation of the earth might introduce a more accurate separation of property, and the habits of a sedentary life; but the love of arms and rapine was still the ruling passion of the Picts: and their warriors, who stripped themselves for a day of battle, were distinguished, in the eyes of the Romans, by the strange fashion of painting their naked bodies, with gaudy colours and fantastic figures.

[1] Symmac. (l. ii. epist. 46). still presumes to mention the sacred names of Socrates and philosophy. Sidonius, bishop of Clermont, might condemn (l. viii. ep. 6.), with *less* inconsistency, the human sacrifices of the Saxons.

[2] In the beginning of the last century, the learned Cambden was obliged to undermine, with respectful scepticism, the romance of *Brutus*, the Trojan; who is now buried in silent oblivion, with *Scota*, the daughter of Pharaoh, and her numerous progeny. Yet I am informed, that some champions of the *Milesian colony* may still be found among the original natives of Ireland. A people dissatisfied with their present condition, grasp at any visions of their past or future glory.

[3] Tacitus, or rather his father-in-law Agricola, might remark the German or Spanish complexion of some British tribes. But it was their sober deliberate opinion, "In universum "tamen æstimanti Gallos vicinum solum occupâsse credibile est. Eorum sacra deprehendas ". . . . sermo haud multum diversus (in Vit. Agricol. c. xi.)." Cæsar had observed their common religion (Com. de Bello Gall. vi. 13.); and in his time, the emigration from the Belgic Gaul was a recent, or at least an historical, event (v. 10.). Cambden, the British Strabo, has modestly ascertained our genuine antiquities (Britannia, i. Introd. 2—31.).

[4] In the dark and doubtful paths of Caledonian antiquity, I have chosen for my guides two learned and ingenious Highlanders, whom their birth and education had peculiarly qualified for that office. (Crit. Disser. on the Orig., Antiq., &c. of the Caledonians, by Dr. John Macpherson, London, 1768, 4to.; and, Introd. to the Hist. of Great Britain and Ireland, by Jas. Macpherson, London, 1773, 4to. Dr. Macpherson was a minister in the Isle of Skye, and it is a circumstance honourable for the present age, that a work, replete with erudition and criticism, should have been composed in the most remote of the Hebrides.

The western part of Caledonia irregularly rises into wild and barren hills, which scarcely repay the toil of the husbandman, and are most profitably used for the pasture of cattle. The highlanders were condemned to the occupations of shepherds and hunters; and as they seldom were fixed to any permanent habitation, they acquired the expressive name of SCOTS, which, in the Celtic tongue, is said to be equivalent to that of *wanderers*, or *vagrants*. The inhabitants of a barren land were urged to seek a fresh supply of food in the waters. The deep lakes and bays which intersect their country, are plentifully stored with fish; and they gradually ventured to cast their nets in the waves of the ocean. The vicinity of the Hebrides, so profusely scattered along the western coast of Scotland, tempted their curiosity, and improved their skill; and they acquired, by slow degrees, the art, or rather the habit, of managing their boats in a tempestuous sea, and of steering their nocturnal course by the light of the well-known stars. The two bold headlands of Caledonia almost touch the shores of a spacious island, which obtained, from its luxuriant vegetation, the epithet of *Green;* and has preserved, with a slight alteration, the name of Erin, or Ierne, or Ireland. It is *probable*, that in some remote period of antiquity, the fertile plains of Ulster received a colony of hungry Scots; and that the strangers of the North, who had dared to encounter the arms of the legions, spread their conquests over the savage and unwarlike natives of a solitary island. It is *certain*, that, in the declining age of the Roman empire, Caledonia, Ireland, and the Isle of Man, were inhabited by the Scots; and that the kindred tribes, who were often associated in military enterprize, were deeply affected by the various accidents of their mutual fortunes. They long cherished the lively tradition of their common name and origin: and the missionaries of the Isle of Saints, who diffused the light of Christianity over North Britain, established the vain opinion, that their Irish countrymen were the natural, as well as spiritual, fathers of the Scottish race. The loose and obscure tradition has been preserved by the venerable Bede, who scattered some rays of light over the darkness of the eighth century. On this slight foundation, an huge superstructure of fable was gradually reared, by the bards, and the monks; two orders of men, who equally abused the privilege of fiction. The Scottish nation, with mistaken pride, adopted their Irish genealogy: and the annals of a long line of imaginary kings have been adorned by the fancy of Boethius, and the classic elegance of Buchanan.[1]

[1] The Irish descent of the Scots has been revived, in the last moments of its decay, and strenuously supported, by the Rev. Mr. Whitaker (Hist. of Manchester, i. 430.; and Genuine History of the Britons asserted, p. 154.). Yet he acknowlegdes, 1. *That* the Scots of Ammian. (A.D. 340.) were already settled in Caledonia; and that the Roman authors do not afford any hints of their emigration from another country. 2. *That all* the accounts of such emigrations, which have been asserted, or received, by Irish bards, Scotch historians, or English antiquaries (Buchanan, Cambden, Usher, Stillingfleet, &c.), are totally fabulous. 3. *That* three of the Irish tribes, which are mentioned by Ptolemy (A.D. 150.) were of the Caledonian extraction. 4. *That* a younger branch of Caledonian princes, of the house of Fingal, acquired and possessed the monarchy of Ireland. After these concessions, the remaining difference between Whitaker and his adversaries is minute and obscure. The *genuine history*, which he produces, of a Fergus, the cousin of Ossian, who was transplanted (A.D. 320) from Ireland to Caledonia, is built on a conjectural supplement to the Erse poetry; and the feeble evidence of Richard of Cirencester, a monk of the fourteenth century. The lively spirit of the learned and ingenious antiquarian has tempted him to forget the nature of a question, which he so *vehemently* debates, and so *absolutely* decides.

Six years after the death of Constantine, the destructive inroads (A.D. 343—366) of the Scots and Picts required the presence of his youngest son, who reigned in the western empire. Constans visited his British dominions: but we may form some estimate of the importance of his achievements, by the language of panegyric, which celebrates only his triumph over the elements; or, in other words, the good fortune of a safe and easy passage, from the port of Boulogne to the harbour of Sandwich.[1] The calamities which the afflicted provincials continued to experience, from foreign war and domestic tyranny, were aggravated by the feeble and corrupt administration of the eunuchs of Constantius; and the transient relief which they might obtain from the virtues of Julian, was soon lost by the absence and death of their benefactor. The sums of gold and silver, which had been painfully collected, or liberally transmitted, for the payment of the troops, were intercepted by the avarice of the commanders; discharges, or, at least, exemptions, from the military service, were publicly sold; the distress of the soldiers, who were injuriously deprived of their legal and scanty subsistence, provoked them to frequent desertion; the nerves of discipline were relaxed, and the highways were infested with robbers.[2] The oppression of the good, and the impunity of the wicked, equally contributed to diffuse through the island a spirit of discontent and revolt; and every ambitious subject, every desperate exile, might entertain a reasonable hope of subverting the weak and distracted government of Britain. The hostile tribes of the North, who detested the pride and power of the King of the World, suspended their domestic feuds; and the Barbarians of the land and sea, the Scots, the Picts, and the Saxons, spread themselves, with rapid and irresistible fury, from the wall of Antoninus to the shores of Kent. Every production of art and nature, every object of convenience or luxury, which they were incapable of creating by labour, or procuring by trade, was accumulated in the rich and fruitful province of Britain.[3] A philosopher may deplore the eternal discord of the human race, but he will confess, that the desire of spoil is a more rational provocation than the vanity of conquest. From the age of Constantine to that of the Plantagenets, this rapacious spirit continued to instigate the poor and hardy Caledonians: but the same people, whose generous humanity seems to inspire the songs of Ossian, was disgraced by a savage ignorance of the virtues of peace, and of the laws of war. Their southern neighbours have felt, and perhaps exaggerated, the cruel depredations of the Scots and Picts:[4] and a valiant tribe of Caledonia, the Attacotti,[5] the enemies, and afterwards the soldiers, of Valentinian,

[1] Hyeme tumentes ac sævientes undas calcâstis Oceani sub remis vestris; . . . insperatam imperatoris faciem Britannus expavit. Julius Firmicus Maternus de Errore Profan. Relig. p. 464. edit. Gronov. ad calcem Minuc. Fæl. Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. iv. 336.).

[2] Liban. Orat. Paren. c. xxxix. p. 264. This curious passage has escaped the diligence of our British antiquaries.

[3] The Caledonians praised and coveted the gold, the steeds, the lights, &c. of the *stranger.* Blair's Dissert. on Ossian, vol. ii. 343; and Macpherson's Introd. p. 242.

[4] Lord Littleton has circumstantially related (Hist. of Hen. II. i. 182.), and Sir Dav. Dalrymple has slightly mentioned (Ann. of Scot. i. 69.), a barbarous inroad of the Scots, at a time (A.D. 1137.) when law, religion, and society, must have softened their primitive manners.

[5] Attacotti bellicosa hominum natio. Ammian. xxvii. 8. Cambden (Introd. p. clii.) has

are accused, by an eye-witness, of delighting in the taste of human flesh. When they hunted the woods for prey, it is said, that they attacked the shepherd rather than his flock; and that they curiously selected the most delicate and brawny parts, both of males and females, which they prepared for their horrid repasts.[1] If, in the neighbourhood of the commercial and literary town of Glasgow, a race of cannibals has really existed, we may contemplate, in the period of the Scottish history, the opposite extremes of savage and civilized life. Such reflections tend to enlarge the circle of our ideas; and to encourage the pleasing hope, that New Zealand may produce, in some future age, the Hume of the Southern Hemisphere.

Every messenger who (A.D. 367—370) escaped across the British channel, conveyed the most melancholy and alarming tidings to the ears of Valentinian; and the emperor was soon informed, that the two military commanders of the province had been surprised and cut off by the Barbarians. Severus, count of the domestics, was hastily dispatched, and as suddenly recalled, by the court of Treves. The representations of Jovinus served only to indicate the greatness of the evil; and, after a long and serious consultation, the defence, or rather the recovery, of Britain, was entrusted to the abilities of the brave Theodosius. The exploits of that general, the father of a line of emperors, have been celebrated, with peculiar complacency, by the writers of the age: but his real merit deserved their applause; and his nomination was received, by the army and province, as a sure presage of approaching victory. He seized the favourable moment of navigation, and securely landed the numerous and veteran bands of the Heruli and Batavians, the Jovians and the Victors. In his march from Sandwich to London, Theodosius defeated several parties of the Barbarians, released a multitude of captives, and, after distributing to his soldiers a small portion of the spoil, established the fame of disinterested justice, by the restitution of the remainder to the rightful proprietors. The citizens of London, who had almost despaired of their safety, threw open their gates; and as soon as Theodosius had obtained from the court of Treves the important aid of a military lieutenant, and a civil governor, he executed, with wisdom and vigour, the laborious task of the deliverance of Britain. The vagrant soldiers were recalled to their standard; an edict of amnesty dispelled the public apprehensions; and his cheerful example alleviated the rigour of martial discipline. The scattered and desultory warfare of the Barbarians, who infested the land and sea, deprived him of the glory of a signal victory; but the prudent spirit, and consummate art, of the Roman general, were displayed in the operations of two campaigns (A.D. 368 and 369), which successively rescued every part of the province from the hands of a cruel and rapacious enemy. The splendour of the cities, and the security of the fortifications, were diligently restored, by the paternal

restored their true name in the text of Jerom. The bands of Attacotti, which Jerom had seen in Gaul, were afterwards stationed in Italy and Illyricum (Notitia, S. viii. xxxix, xl.).

[1] Cum ipse adolescentulus in Galliâ viderim Attacottos (or Scotos) gentem Britannicam humanis vesci carnibus; et cum per silvas porcorum greges, et armentorum pecudumque reperiant, pastorum *nates* et feminarum *papillas* solere abscindere; et has solas ciborum delicias arbitrari. Such is the evidence of Jerom (ii. 75.), whose veracity I find no reason to question.

care of Theodosius: who with a strong hand confined the trembling Caledonians to the northern angle of the island; and perpetuated, by the name and settlement of the new province of *Valentia*, the glories of the reign of Valentinian.[1] The voice of poetry and panegyric may add, perhaps with some degree of truth, that the unknown regions of Thule were stained with the blood of the Picts; that the oars of Theodosius dashed the waves of the Hyperborean ocean; and that the distant Orkneys were the scene of his naval victory over the Saxon pirates.[2] He left the province with a fair, as well as splendid, reputation; and was immediately promoted to the rank of master-general of the cavalry, by a prince, who could applaud, without envy, the merit of his servants. In the important station of the Upper Danube, the conqueror of Britain checked and defeated the armies of the Alemanni, before he was chosen to suppress the revolt of Africa.

III. The prince who refuses to be the judge, instructs his people to consider him as the accomplice, of his ministers. The military command of Africa had been long exercised (A. D. 366, &c.) by Count Romanus, and his abilities were not inadequate to his station: but as sordid interest was the sole motive of his conduct, he acted, on most occasions, as if he had been the enemy of the province, and the friend of the Barbarians of the desert. The three flourishing cities of Oea, Leptis, and Sabrata, which, under the name of Tripoli, had long constituted a federal union,[3] were obliged, for the first time, to shut their gates against a hostile invasion; several of their most honourable citizens were surprised and massacred; the villages, and even the suburbs, were pillaged; and the vines and fruit-trees of that rich territory were extirpated by the malicious savages of Getulia. The unhappy provincials implored the protection of Romanus; but they soon found that their military governor was not less cruel and rapacious than the Barbarians. As they were incapable of furnishing the 4000 camels, and the exorbitant present, which he required, before he would march to the assistance of Tripoli; his demand was equivalent to a refusal, and he might justly be accused as the author of the public calamity. In the annual assembly of the three cities, they nominated two deputies, to lay at the feet of Valentinian the customary offering of a gold victory; and to accompany this tribute, of duty,

[1] Ammianus has concisely represented (xx. 1. xxvi. 4. xxvii. 8. xxviii. 3.), the whole series of the British war.

[2] Horrescit . . . . ratibus . . . impervia Thule.
Ille . . . . nec falso nomine Pictos
Edomuit. Scotumque vago mucrone secutus
Fregit Hyperboreas remis audacibus undas.
Claudian, in iii Cons. Honorii, ver. 53, &c.

——— Maduerunt Saxone fuso
Orcades: incaluit Pictorum sanguine Thule.
Scotorum cumulos flevit glacialis Ierne.
In iv Cons. Hon. ver. 31, &c.

See likewise Pacatus (in Paneg. Vet. xii. 5.). But it is not easy to appreciate the intrinsic value of flattery and metaphor. Compare the *British* victories of Bolanus (Statius, Silv. v. 2.) with his real character (Tacit. in Vit. Agricol. c. 16.).

[3] Ammianus frequently mentions their concilium annuum, legitimum, &c. Leptis and Sabrata are long since ruined; but the city of Oea, the native country of Apuleius, still flourishes under the provincial denomination of *Tripoli*. Cellarius (Geog. Antiq. ii. part ii 81.), D'Anville (Geog. Anc. iii. 71.), and Marmol (Afrique, ii. 562.).

rather than of gratitude, with their humble complaint, that they were ruined by the enemy, and betrayed by their governor. If the severity of Valentinian had been rightly directed, it would have fallen on the guilty head of Romanus. But the Count, long exercised in the arts of corruption, had dispatched a swift and trusty messenger to secure the venal friendship of Remigius, master of the offices. The wisdom of the Imperial council was deceived by artifice; and their honest indignation was cooled by delay. At length, when the repetition of complaint had been justified by the repetition of public misfortunes, the notary Palladius was sent from the court of Treves, to examine the state of Africa, and the conduct of Romanus. The rigid impartiality of Palladius was easily disarmed: he was tempted to reserve for himself a part of the public treasure, which he brought with him for the payment of the troops; and from the moment that he was conscious of his own guilt, he could no longer refuse to attest the innocence and merit of the Count. The charge of the Tripolitans was declared to be false and frivolous; and Palladius himself was sent back from Treves to Africa, with a special commission, to discover and prosecute the authors of this impious conspiracy against the representatives of the sovereign. His inquiries were managed with so much dexterity and success, that he compelled the citizens of Leptis, who had sustained a recent siege of eight days, to contradict the truth of their own decrees, and to censure the behaviour of their own deputies. A bloody sentence was pronounced, without hesitation, by the rash and headstrong cruelty of Valentinian. The president of Tripoli, who had presumed to pity the distress of the province, was publicly executed at Utica; four distinguished citizens were put to death, as the accomplices of the imaginary fraud; and the tongues of two others were cut out, by the express order of the emperor. Romanus, elated by impunity, and irritated by resistance, was still continued in the military command; till the Africans were provoked, by his avarice, to join the rebellious standard of Firmus, the Moor.[1]

His father Nabal was one of the richest and most powerful of the Moorish princes who acknowledged the supremacy of Rome. But as he left (A.D. 372), either by his wives or concubines, a very numerous posterity, the wealthy inheritance was eagerly disputed; and Zamma, one of his sons, was slain in a domestic quarrel by his brother Firmus. The implacable zeal, with which Romanus prosecuted the legal revenge of this murder, could be ascribed only to a motive of avarice, or personal hatred: but on this occasion, his claims were just; his influence was weighty; and Firmus clearly understood, that he must either present his neck to the executioner, or appeal from the sentence of the Imperial consistory, to his sword, and to the people.[2] He was received as the deliverer of his country; and, as soon as it appeared that Romanus was formidable only to a submissive province, the tyrant of Africa became the object of universal contempt. The

[1] Ammian. xviii. 6. Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. p. 25. 676.) has discussed the chronological difficulties of the history of Count Romanus.

[2] The chronology of Ammianus is loose and obscure: and Oros. (l. vii. c. 33. p. 551. ed. Havercamp.) seems to place the revolt of Firmus after the deaths of Valentinian and Valens. Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 691.) endeavours to pick his way. The patient and sure-footed mule of the Alps may be trusted in the most slippery paths.

ruin of Cæsarea, which was plundered and burnt by the licentious Barbarians, convinced the refractory cities of the danger of resistance; the power of Firmus was established, at least in the provinces of Mauritania and Numidia; and it seemed to be his only doubt, whether he should assume the diadem of a Moorish king, or the purple of a Roman emperor. But the imprudent and unhappy Africans soon discovered, that, in this rash insurrection, they had not sufficiently consulted their own strength, or the abilities of their leader. Before he could procure any certain intelligence, that the emperor of the West had fixed the choice of a general, or that a fleet of transports was collected at the mouth of the Rhone, he was suddenly informed, that the great Theodosius (A.D. 373), with a small band of veterans, had landed near Igilgilis, or Gigeri, on the African coast; and the timid usurper sunk under the ascendant of virtue and military genius. Though Firmus possessed arms and treasures, his despair of victory immediately reduced him to the use of those arts, which, in the same country, and in a similar situation, had formerly been practised by the crafty Jugurtha. He attempted to deceive, by an apparent submission, the vigilance of the Roman general; to seduce the fidelity of his troops; and to protract the duration of the war, by successively engaging the independent tribes of Africa to espouse his quarrel, or to protect his flight. Theodosius imitated the example, and obtained the success, of his predecessor Metellus. When Firmus, in the character of a suppliant, accused his own rashness, and humbly solicited the clemency of the emperor, the lieutenant of Valentinian received and dismissed him with a friendly embrace; but he diligently required the useful and substantial pledges of a sincere repentance; nor could he be persuaded, by the assurances of peace, to suspend, for an instant, the operations of an active war. A dark conspiracy was detected by the penetration of Theodosius; and he satisfied, without much reluctance, the public indignation, which he had secretly excited. Several of the guilty accomplices of Firmus were abandoned, according to ancient custom, to the tumult of a military execution; many more, by the amputation of both their hands, continued to exhibit an instructive spectacle of horror; the hatred of the rebels was accompanied with fear; and the fear of the Roman soldiers was mingled with respectful admiration. Amidst the boundless plains of Getulia, and the innumerable valleys of mount Atlas, it was impossible to prevent the escape of Firmus: and if the usurper could have tired the patience of his antagonist, he would have secured his person in the depth of some remote solitude, and expected the hopes of a future revolution. He was subdued by the perseverance of Theodosius; who had formed an inflexible determination, that the war should end only by the death of the tyrant, and that every nation of Africa, which presumed to support his cause, should be involved in his ruin. At the head of a small body of troops, which seldom exceeded 3500 men, the Roman general advanced, with a steady prudence, devoid of rashness, or of fear, into the heart of a country, where he was sometimes attacked by armies of 20,000 Moors. The boldness of his charge dismayed the irregular Barbarians; they were disconcerted by his seasonable and orderly retreats; they were continually baffled by the

unknown resources of the military art; and they felt and confessed the just superiority which was assumed by the leader of a civilized nation. When Theodosius entered the extensive dominions of Igmazen, king of the Isaflenses, the haughty savage required, in words of defiance, his name, and the object of his expedition. "I am, re-"plied the stern and disdainful count, I am the general of Valen-"tinian, the lord of the world; who has sent me hither to pursue and "punish a desperate robber. Deliver him instantly into my hands; "and be assured, that if thou dost not obey the commands of my in-"vincible sovereign, thou, and the people over whom thou reignest, "shall be utterly extirpated." As soon as Igmazen was satisfied that his enemy had strength and resolution to execute the fatal menace, he consented to purchase a necessary peace by the sacrifice of a guilty fugitive. The guards that were placed to secure the person of Firmus, deprived him of the hopes of escape; and the Moorish tyrant, after wine had extinguished the sense of danger, disappointed the insulting triumph of the Romans, by strangling himself in the night. His dead body, the only present which Igmazen could offer to the conqueror, was carelessly thrown upon a camel: and Theodosius, leading back his victorious troops to Sitifi, was saluted by the warmest acclamations of joy and loyalty.[1]

Africa had been lost by the vices of Romanus; it was restored by the virtues of Theodosius: and our curiosity may be usefully directed to the inquiry of the respective treatment, which the two generals received from the Imperial court. The authority of Count Romanus had been suspended by the master-general of the cavalry; and he was committed to safe and honourable custody till the end of the war. His crimes were proved by the most authentic evidence; and the public expected, with some impatience, the decree of severe justice. But the partial and powerful favour of Mellobaudes encouraged him to challenge his legal judges, to obtain repeated delays for the purpose of procuring a crowd of friendly witnesses, and, finally, to cover his guilty conduct by the additional guilt of fraud and forgery. About the same time, the restorer of Britain and Africa, on a vague suspicion that his name and services were superior to the rank of a subject, was (A.D. 376) ignominiously beheaded at Carthage. Valentinian no longer reigned; and the death of Theodosius, as well as the impunity of Romanus, may justly be imputed to the arts of the ministers who abused the confidence, and deceived the inexperienced youth, of his sons.[2]

If the geographical accuracy of Ammianus had been fortunately bestowed on the British exploits of Theodosius, we should have traced, with eager curiosity, the distinct and domestic footsteps of his march. But the tedious enumeration of the unknown and uninteresting tribes of Africa may be reduced to the general remark, that they were all of the swarthy race of the Moors; that they inhabited the back settlements of the Mauritanian and Numidian provinces, the country, as they have since been termed by the Arabs, of dates and of

[1] Ammian. xxix. 5. The text of this long chapter (15 4to pages) is broken and corrupted, and the narrative is perplexed by the want of chronological and geographical land-marks.
[2] Ammianus, xxviii. 4. Orosius, l. vii. c. 33. p. 551, 552. Jerom. in Chron. p. 187.

locusts;[1] and that, as the Roman power declined in Africa, the boundary of civilized manners and cultivated land was insensibly contracted. Beyond the utmost limits of the Moors, the vast and inhospitable desert of the South extends above 1000 miles to the banks of the Niger. The ancients, who had a very faint and imperfect knowledge of the great peninsula of Africa, were sometimes tempted to believe, that the torrid zone must ever remain destitute of inhabitants:[2] and they sometimes amused their fancy by filling the vacant space with headless men, or rather monsters;[3] with horned and cloven-footed satyrs;[4] with fabulous centaurs;[5] and with human pygmies, who waged a bold and doubtful warfare against the cranes.[6] Carthage would have trembled at the strange intelligence, that the countries, on either side of the equator, were filled with innumerable nations, who differed only in their colour from the ordinary appearance of the human species; and the subjects of the Roman empire might have anxiously expected, that the swarms of Barbarians, which issued from the North, would soon be encountered from the South, by new swarms of Barbarians, equally fierce, and equally formidable. These gloomy terrors would indeed have been dispelled by a more intimate acquaintance with the character of their African enemies. The inaction of the negroes does not seem to be the effect, either of their virtue, or of their pusillanimity. They indulge, like the rest of mankind, their passions and appetites; and the adjacent tribes are engaged in frequent acts of hostility.[7] But their rude ignorance has never invented any effectual weapons of defence, or of destruction; they appear incapable of forming any extensive plans of government, or conquest; and the obvious inferiority of their mental faculties has been discovered and abused by the nations of the temperate zone. Sixty thousand blacks are annually embarked from the coast of Guinea, never to return to their native country; but they are embarked in chains (*Hist. Philos. et Politique*, iv. 192) : and this constant emigration, which, in the space of two centuries, might have

[1] Leo Africanus (Viaggi di Ramusio, i. 78.) has traced a curious picture of the people and the country; which are more minutely described in the Afrique de Marmol. iii. 1—54.

[2] This uninhabitable zone was gradually reduced, by the improvements of ancient geography, from 45, to 24, or even 16, degrees of latitude. Robertson, Hist. of America, i. 426.

[3] Intra, si credere libet, vix jam homines et magis semiferi . . . Blemmyes, Satyri, &c. Pomponius Mela. i. 4. p. 26. edit. Voss. in 8vo. Pliny *philosophically* explains (vi. 35.) the irregularities of nature, which he had *credulously* admitted (v. 8.).

[4] If the satyr was the Orang-outang, the great human ape (Buffon, Hist. Nat. xiv. 43.), one of that species might actually be shown alive at Alexandria in the reign of Constantine. Yet some difficulty will still remain about the conversation which St. Anthony held with one of these pious savages in the desert of Thebais (Jerom. in Vit. Paul. Eremit. i. 238.).

[5] St. Anthony likewise met one of *these* monsters; whose existence was seriously asserted by the emperor Claudius. The public laughed; but this præfect of Egypt had the address to send an artful preparation, the embalmed corpse of an *Hippocentaur*; which was preserved almost a century afterwards in the Imperial palace. Pliny (Hist. Natur. vii. 3.), and the judicious observations of Freret (Mem. de l'Acad. vii. 321.).

[6] The fable of the pygmies is as old as Homer (Iliad. iii. 6.). The pygmies of India and Æthiopia were (trispithami) twenty-seven inches high. Every spring their cavalry (mounted on rams and goats) marched, in battle-array, to destroy the cranes' eggs, aliter (says Pliny) futuris gregibus non resisti. Their houses were built of mud, feathers, and egg-shells. Pliny vi. 35. vii. 2.) and Strabo (l. ii. 121.).

[7] Vols. 3, 4 of the valuable Hist. des Voyag. describe the present state of the negroes. The nations of the sea-coast have been polished by European commerce; and those of the inland country have been improved by Moorish colonies.

furnished armies to overrun the globe, accuses the guilt of Europe, and the weakness of Africa.

IV. The ignominious treaty which saved the army of Jovian, had been faithfully executed on the side of the Romans: and as they had solemnly renounced the sovereignty and alliance of Armenia and Iberia, those tributary kingdoms were exposed, without protection, to the arms of the Persian monarch.[1] Sapor (A.D. 365—378) entered the Armenian territories at the head of a formidable host of cuirassiers, of archers, and of mercenary foot; but it was the invariable practice of Sapor to mix war and negociation, and to consider falsehood and perjury as the most powerful instruments of regal policy. He affected to praise the prudent and moderate conduct of the king of Armenia; and the unsuspicious Tiranus was persuaded, by the repeated assurances of insidious friendship, to deliver his person into the hands of a faithless and cruel enemy. In the midst of a splendid entertainment, he was bound in chains of silver, as an honour due to the blood of the Arsacides; and, after a short confinement in the Tower of Oblivion at Ecbatana, he was released from the miseries of life, either by his own dagger, or by that of an assassin. The kingdom of Armenia was reduced to the state of a Persian province; the administration was shared between a distinguished satrap and a favourite eunuch; and Sapor marched, without delay, to subdue the martial spirit of the Iberians. Sauromaces, who reigned in that country by the permission of the emperors, was expelled by a superior force; and, as an insult on the majesty of Rome, the King of kings placed a diadem on the head of his abject vassal Aspacuras. The city of Artogerassa[2] was the only place of Armenia, which presumed to resist the effort of his arms. The treasure deposited in that strong fortress tempted the avarice of Sapor; but the danger of Olympias, the wife, or widow, of the Armenian king, excited the public compassion, and animated the desperate valour of her subjects and soldiers. The Persians were surprised and repulsed under the walls of Artogerassa, by a bold and well-concerted sally of the besieged. But the forces of Sapor were continually renewed and increased; the hopeless courage of the garrison was exhausted; the strength of the walls yielded to the assault; and the proud conqueror, after wasting the rebellious city with fire and sword, led away captive an unfortunate queen; who, in a more auspicious hour, had been the destined bride of the son of Constantine.[3] Yet if Sapor already triumphed in the easy conquest of two dependent kingdoms, he soon felt, that a country is unsubdued as long as the minds of the people are actuated by an hostile and contumacious spirit. The satraps, whom he was obliged to trust, embraced the first opportunity of

[1] The evidence of Ammianus is original and decisive (xxvii. 12.). Moses of Chorene (l. iii. c. 17. p. 249. and c. 34. p. 269.), and Procop. (de Bell. Pers. l. i. c. 5. p. 17. ed. Louvre), have been consulted: but those historians, who confound distinct facts, repeat the same events, and introduce strange stories, must be used with diffidence and caution.

[2] Perhaps Artagera, or Ardis; under whose walls Caius, the grandson of Augustus, was wounded. This fortress was situate above Amida, near one of the sources of the Tigris. D'Anville, Geog. Anc. ii. 106.

[3] Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 701.) proves, from chronology, that Olympias must have been the mother of Para.

regaining the affection of their countrymen, and of signalizing their immortal hatred to the Persian name. Since the conversion of the Armenians and Iberians, those nations considered the Christians as the favourites, and the Magians as the adversaries, of the Supreme Being; the influence of the clergy, over a superstitious people, was uniformly exerted in the cause of Rome; and as long as the successors of Constantine disputed with those of Artaxerxes the sovereignty of the intermediate provinces, the religious connexion always threw a decisive advantage into the scale of the empire. A numerous and active party acknowledged Para, the son of Tiranus, as the lawful sovereign of Armenia; and his title to the throne was deeply rooted in the hereditary succession of five hundred years. By the unanimous consent of the Iberians, the country was equally divided between the rival princes; and Aspacuras, who owed his diadem to the choice of Sapor, was obliged to declare, that his regard for his children, who were detained as hostages by the tyrant, was the only consideration, which prevented him from openly renouncing the alliance of Persia. The emperor Valens, who respected the obligations of the treaty, and who was apprehensive of involving the East in a dangerous war, ventured, with slow and cautious measures, to support the Roman party in the kingdoms of Iberia and Armenia. Twelve legions established the authority of Sauromaces on the banks of the Cyrus. The Euphrates was protected by the valour of Arintheus. A powerful army, under the command of Count Trajan, and of Vadomair, king of the Alemanni, fixed their camp on the confines of Armenia. But they were strictly enjoined, not to commit the first hostilities, which might be understood as a breach of the treaty: and such was the implicit obedience of the Roman general, that they retreated, with exemplary patience, under a shower of Persian arrows, till they had clearly acquired a just title to an honourable and legitimate victory. Yet these appearances of war insensibly subsided in a vain and tedious negociation. The contending parties supported their claims by mutual reproaches of perfidy and ambition; and it should seem, that the original treaty was expressed in very obscure terms, since they were reduced to the necessity of making their inconclusive appeal to the partial testimony of the generals of the two nations, who had assisted at the negociations.[1] The invasion of the Goths and Huns, which soon afterwards shook the foundations of the Roman empire, exposed the provinces of Asia to the arms of Sapor. But the declining age, and perhaps the infirmities, of the monarch, suggested new maxims of tranquillity and moderation. His death, which happened (A.D. 380) in the full maturity of a reign of seventy years, changed in a moment the court and councils of Persia; and their attention was most probably engaged by domestic troubles, and the distant efforts of a Carmanian war.[2] The remembrance of ancient injuries was lost

[1] Ammian. (xxvii. 22. xxix. 1. xxx. 1, 2.) has described the events, without the dates, of the Persian war. Moses of Chorene (Hist. Armen. l. iii. c. 28. p. 261. c. 31. p. 266. c. 35. p. 271.) affords some additional facts; but it is extremely difficult to separate truth from fable.

[2] Artaxerxes was the successor and brother (*the cousin-german*) of the great Sapor; and the guardian of his son Sapor III. (Agathias, l. iv. 136. ed. Louvre. Univ. Hist. xi. 86. 161. The authors of that unequal work have compiled the Sassanian dynasty with erudition and diligence: but it is a preposterous arrangement to divide the Roman and Oriental accounts into two distinct histories.

in the enjoyment of peace. The kingdoms of Armenia and Iberia were (A.D. 384) permitted, by the mutual, though tacit, consent of both empires, to resume their doubtful neutrality. In the first years of the reign of Theodosius, a Persian embassy arrived at Constantinople, to excuse the unjustifiable measures of the former reign; and to offer, as the tribute of friendship, or even of respect, a splendid present of gems, of silk, and of Indian elephants.[1]

In the general picture of the affairs of the East under the reign of Valens, the adventures of Para form one of the most striking and singular objects. The noble youth, by the persuasion of his mother Olympias, had escaped through the Persian host that besieged Artogerassa, and implored the protection of the emperor of the East. By his timid councils, Para was alternately supported, and recalled, and restored, and betrayed. The hopes of the Armenians were sometimes raised by the presence of their natural sovereign; and the ministers of Valens were satisfied, that they preserved the integrity of the public faith, if their vassal was not suffered to assume the diadem and title of King. But they soon repented of their own rashness. They were confounded by the reproaches and threats of the Persian monarch. They found reason to distrust the cruel and inconstant temper of Para himself: who sacrificed, to the slightest suspicions, the lives of his most faithful servants; and held a secret and disgraceful correspondence with the assassin of his father, and the enemy of his country. Under the specious pretence of consulting with the emperor on the subject of their common interest, Para was persuaded to descend from the mountains of Armenia, where his party was in arms, and to trust his independence and safety to the discretion of a perfidious court. The king of Armenia, for such he appeared in his own eyes and in those of his nation, was received with due honours by the governors of the provinces through which he passed; but when he arrived at Tarsus in Cilicia, his progress was stopped under various pretences; his motions were watched with respectful vigilance; and he gradually discovered, that he was a prisoner in the hands of the Romans. Para suppressed his indignation, dissembled his fears, and, after secretly preparing his escape, mounted on horseback with 300 of his faithful followers. The officer stationed at the door of his apartment immediately communicated his flight to the consular of Cilicia, who overtook him in the suburbs, and endeavoured, without success, to dissuade him from prosecuting his rash and dangerous design. A legion was ordered to pursue the royal fugitive; but the pursuit of infantry could not be very alarming to a body of light cavalry; and upon the first cloud of arrows that was discharged into the air, they retreated with precipitation to the gates of Tarsus. After an incessant march of two days and two nights, Para and his Armenians reached the banks of the Euphrates; but the passage of the river, which they were obliged to swim, was attended with some delay and some loss. The country was alarmed; and the two roads, which were only separated by an interval of 3 miles, had been occupied by 1000 archers on horseback, under the command of a count and a tribune. Para must have yielded to superior force, if

[1] Pacatus in Paneg. Vet. xii. 22. and Oros. l. vii. c. 34. Ictumque tum fœdus est, quo universus Oriens usque ad nunc (A.D. 416.) tranquillissimè fruitur.

the accidental arrival of a friendly traveller had not revealed the danger, and the means of escape. A dark and almost impervious path securely conveyed the Armenian troop through the thicket; and Para had left behind him the count and the tribune, while they patiently expected his approach along the public highways. They returned to the Imperial court to excuse their want of diligence or success: and seriously alleged, that the king of Armenia, who was a skilful magician, had transformed himself and his followers, and passed before their eyes under a borrowed shape. After his return to his native kingdom, Para still continued to profess himself the friend and ally of the Romans; but the Romans had injured him too deeply ever to forgive, and the secret sentence of his death was signed in the council of Valens. The execution of the bloody deed was committed to the subtle prudence of Count Trajan; and he had the merit of insinuating himself into the confidence of the credulous prince, that he might find an opportunity of stabbing him to the heart. Para was invited to a Roman banquet, which had been prepared with all the pomp and sensuality of the East; the hall resounded with cheerful music, and the company was already heated with wine; when the count retired for an instant, drew his sword, and gave the signal of the murder. A robust and desperate Barbarian instantly rushed on the king of Armenia; and though he bravely defended his life with the first weapon that chance offered to his hand, the table of the Imperial general was (A.D. 374) stained with the royal blood of a guest, and an ally. Such were the weak and wicked maxims of the Roman administration, that, to attain a doubtful object of political interest, the laws of nations, and the sacred rights of hospitality, were inhumanly violated in the face of the world.[1]

V. During a peaceful interval of thirty years, the Romans secured their frontiers, and the Goths extended their dominions. The victories of the great Hermanric,[2] king of the Ostrogoths, and the most noble of the race of the Amali, have been compared, by the enthusiasm of his countrymen, to the exploits of Alexander: with this singular, and almost incredible, difference, that the martial spirit of the Gothic hero, instead of being supported by the vigour of youth, was displayed with glory and success in the extreme period of human life; between the age of fourscore and one hundred and ten years. The independent tribes were persuaded, or compelled, to acknowledge the king of the Ostrogoths as the sovereign of the Gothic nation: the chiefs of the Visigoths, or Thervingi, renounced the royal title, and assumed the more humble appellation of *Judges;* and, among those judges, Athanaric, Fritigern, and Alavivus, were the most illustrious, by their personal merit, as well as by their vicinity to the Roman provinces. These domestic conquests, which increased the military power of Hermanric, enlarged his ambitious designs. He invaded the adjacent countries of the North; and twelve considerable nations, whose names and limits cannot be accurately defined, successively yielded to the superiority of the

[1] Ammian. (xxx. 1.) the adventures of Para. Moses of Chorene calls him Tiridates; and tells a long, and not improbable, story of his son Gnelus; who afterwards made himself popular in Armenia, and provoked the jealousy of the reigning king (l. iii. c. 21, p. 253.).

[2] The concise account of the reign and conquests of Hermanric, seems to be one of the valuable fragments which Jornan. (c. 28.) borrowed from the Gothic histories of Ablavius, or Cassiodorus.

Gothic arms.[1] The Heruli, who inhabited the marshy lands near the lake Mæotis, were renowned for their strength and agility; and the assistance of their light infantry was eagerly solicited, and highly esteemed, in all the wars of the Barbarians. But the active spirit of the Heruli was subdued by the slow and steady perseverance of the Goths; and, after a bloody action, in which the king was slain, the emains of that warlike tribe became an useful accession to the camp of Hermanric. He then marched against the Venedi; unskilled in the use of arms, and formidable only by their numbers, which filled the wide extent of the plains of modern Poland. The victorious Goths, who were not inferior in numbers, prevailed in the contest, by the decisive advantages of exercise and discipline. After the submission of the Venedi, the conqueror advanced, without resistance, as far as the confines of the Æstii;[2] an ancient people whose name is still preserved in the province of Esthonia. Those distant inhabitants of the Baltic coast were supported by the labours of agriculture, enriched by the trade of amber, and consecrated by the peculiar worship of the Mother of the Gods. But the scarcity of iron obliged the Æstian warriors to content themselves with wooden clubs; and the reduction of that wealthy country is ascribed to the prudence, rather than to the arms, of Hermanric. His dominions, which extended from the Danube to the Baltic, included the native seats, and the recent acquisitions, of the Goths; and he reigned over the greatest part of Germany and Scythia with the authority of a conqueror, and sometimes with the cruelty of a tyrant. But he reigned over a part of the globe incapable of perpetuating and adorning the glory of its heroes. The name of Hermanric is almost buried in oblivion; his exploits are imperfectly known; and the Romans themselves appeared unconscious of the progress of an aspiring power, which threatened the liberty of the North, and the peace of the empire.[3]

The Goths had contracted an hereditary attachment for the Imperial house of Constantine, of whose power and liberality they had received so many signal proofs. They respected the public peace: and if an hostile band sometimes presumed to pass the Roman limit, their irregular conduct was candidly ascribed to the ungovernable spirit of the Barbarian youth. Their contempt for two new and obscure princes, who had (A.D. 366) been raised to the throne by a popular election, inspired the Goths with bolder hopes; and, while they agitated some design of marching their confederate force under the national standard,[4] they were easily tempted to embrace the party of Procopius; and to foment, by their dangerous aid, the civil discord of the Romans. The public treaty might stipulate no more than 10,000

[1] De Buat (Hist. des Peup. de l'Eur. vi. 311.) investigates, with more industry than success, the nations subdued by the arms of Hermanric. He denies the existence of the *Vasinobroncæ*, on account of the immoderate length of their name. Yet the French envoy to Ratisbon, or Dresden, must have traversed the country of the *Mediomatrici.*

[2] The edition of Grotius (Jornan. p. 642.) exhibits the name of *Æstri.* But reason, and the Ambrosian MS. have restored the *Æstii,* whose manners and situation are expressed by the pencil of Tacitus (Germ. c. 45.).

[3] Ammian. (xxxi. 3.) observes, in general terms: Ermenrichi . . . . nobilissimi Regis, et, per multa variaque fortiter facta, vicinis gentibus formidati, &c.

[4] Valens . . . . docetur relationibus Ducum, gentem Gothorum, eâ tempestate intactam ideoque sævissimam, conspirantem in unum, ad pervadendam parari collimitia Thraciarum. Ammian. xxvi. 6.

auxiliaries; but the design was so zealously adopted by the chiefs of the Visigoths, that the army which passed the Danube amounted to the number of 30,000 men.[1] They marched with the proud confidence, that their invincible valour would decide the fate of the Roman empire; and the provinces of Thrace groaned under the weight of the Barbarians, who displayed the insolence of masters, and the licentiousness of enemies. But the intemperance which gratified their appetites, retarded their progress; and before the Goths could receive any certain intelligence of the defeat and death of Procopius, they perceived, by the hostile state of the country, that the civil and military powers were resumed by his successful rival. A chain of posts and fortifications, skilfully disposed by Valens, or the generals of Valens, resisted their march, prevented their retreat, and intercepted their subsistence. The fierceness of the Barbarians was tamed and suspended by hunger: they indignantly threw down their arms at the feet of the conqueror, who offered them food and chains: the numerous captives were distributed in all the cities of the East; and the provincials, who were soon familiarized with their savage appearance, ventured, by degrees, to measure their own strength with these formidable adversaries, whose name had so long been the object of their terror. The king of Scythia (and Hermanric alone could deserve so lofty a title) was grieved and exasperated by this national calamity. His ambassadors loudly complained, at the court of Valens, of the infraction of the ancient and solemn alliance, which had so long subsisted between the Romans and the Goths. They alleged, that they had fulfilled the duty of allies, by assisting the kinsman and successor of the emperor Julian; they required the immediate restitution of the noble captives; and they urged a very singular claim, that the Gothic generals, marching in arms, and in hostile array, were entitled to the sacred character and privileges of ambassadors. The decent, but peremptory, refusal of these extravagant demands, was signified to the Barbarians by Victor, mester-general of the cavalry; who expressed, with force and dignity, the just complaints of the Emperor of the East.[2] The negociation was interrupted; and the manly exhortations of Valentinian encouraged his timid brother to vindicate the insulted majesty of the empire.[3]

The splendour and magnitude of this Gothic war (A.D. 367, 368, 369) are celebrated by a contemporary historian:[4] but the events scarcely deserve the attention of posterity, except as the preliminary steps of the approaching decline and fall of the empire. Instead of leading the nations of Germany and Scythia to the banks of the Danube, or even

[1] M. de Buat (Hist. des Peup. de l'Eur. vi. 332.) has curiously ascertained the real number of these auxiliaries. The 3000 of Ammianus, and the 10,000 of Zosimus, were only the first divisions of the Gothic army.

[2] The march, and subsequent negociation, are described in the Fragments of Eunap. (Excerpt. Legat. p. 18. ed. Louvre). The provincials, who afterwards became familiar with the Barbarians, found that their strength was more apparent than real. They were tall of stature; but their legs were clumsy, and their shoulders were narrow.

[3] Valens enim, ut consulto placuerat fratri, cujus regebatur arbitrio, arma concussit in Gothos ratione justâ permotus. Ammianus (xxvii. 4.) then proceeds to describe, not the country of the Goths, but the peaceful and obedient province of Thrace, which was not affected by the war.

[4] Eunap. in Excerpt. Legat. p. 18. The Greek sophist must have considered as *one* and the *same* war, the whole series of Gothic history till the victories and peace of Theodosius.

to the gates of Constantinople, the aged monarch of the Goths resigned to the brave Athanaric the danger and glory of a defensive war, against an enemy, who wielded with a feeble hand the powers of a mighty state. A bridge of boats was established upon the Danube; the presence of Valens animated his troops; and his ignorance of the art of war was compensated by personal bravery, and a wise deference to the advice of Victor and Arintheus, his masters-general of the cavalry and infantry. The operations of the campaign were conducted by their skill and experience; but they found it impossible to drive the Visigoths from their strong posts in the mountains: and the devastation of the plains obliged the Romans themselves to repass the Danube on the approach of winter. The incessant rains, which swelled the waters of the river, produced a tacit suspension of arms, and confined the emperor Valens, during the whole course of the ensuing summer, to his camp of Marcianapolis. The third year of the war was more favourable to the Romans, and more pernicious to the Goths. The interruption of trade deprived the Barbarians of the objects of luxury, which they already confounded with the necessaries of life; and the desolation of a very extensive tract of country threatened them with the horrors of famine. Athanaric was provoked, or compelled, to risk a battle, which he lost, in the plains; and the pursuit was rendered more bloody by the cruel precaution of the victorious generals, who had promised a large reward for the head of every Goth that was brought into the Imperial camp. The submission of the Barbarians appeased the resentment of Valens and his council; the emperor listened with satisfaction to the flattering and eloquent remonstrance of the senate of Constantinople, which assumed, for the first time, a share in the public deliberations; and the same generals, Victor and Arintheus, who had successfully directed the conduct of the war, were empowered to regulate the conditions of peace. The freedom of trade, which the Goths had hitherto enjoyed, was restricted to two cities on the Danube; the rashness of their leaders was severely punished by the suppression of their pensions and subsidies; and the exception, which was stipulated in favour of Athanaric alone, was more advantageous than honourable to the judge of the Visigoths. Athanaric, who, on this occasion, appears to have consulted his private interest, without expecting the orders of his sovereign, supported his own dignity, and that of his tribe, in the personal interview which was proposed by the ministers of Valens. He persisted in his declaration, that it was impossible for him, without incurring the guilt of perjury, ever to set his foot on the territory of the empire; and it is more than probable, that his regard for the sanctity of an oath was confirmed by the recent and fatal examples of Roman treachery. The Danube, which separated the dominions of the two independent nations, was chosen for the scene of the conference. The Emperor of the East, and the Judge of the Visigoths, accompanied by an equal number of armed followers, advanced in their respective barges to the middle of the stream. After the ratification of the treaty, and the delivery of hostages, Valens returned in triumph to Constantinople; and the Goths remained in a state of tranquillity about six years; till they were vio-

lently impelled against the Roman empire, by an innumerable host of Scythians, who appeared to issue from the frozen regions of the north.[1]

The Emperor of the West, who had (A.D. 374) resigned to his brother the command of the Lower Danube, reserved for his immediate care the defence of the Rhætian and Illyrian provinces, which spread so many hundred miles along the greatest of the European rivers The active policy of Valentinian was continually employed in adding new fortifications to the security of the frontier: but the abuse of this policy provoked the just resentment of the Barbarians. The Quadi complained, that the ground for an intended fortress had been marked out on their territories; and their complaints were urged with so much reason and moderation, that Equitius, master-general of Illyricum, consented to suspend the prosecution of the work, till he should be more clearly informed of the will of his sovereign. This fair occasion of injuring a rival, and of advancing the fortune of his son, was eagerly embraced by the inhuman Maximin, the præfect, or rather tyrant, of Gaul. The passions of Valentinian were impatient of control; and he credulously listened to the assurances of his favourite, that if the government of Valeria, and the direction of the work, were entrusted to the zeal of his son Marcellinus, the emperor should no longer be importuned with the audacious remonstrances of the Barbarians. The subjects of Rome, and the natives of Germany, were insulted by the arrogance of a young and worthless minister, who considered his rapid elevation as the proof and reward of his superior merit. He affected, however, to receive the modest application of Gabinius, king of the Quadi, with some attention and regard: but this artful civility concealed a dark and bloody design, and the credulous prince was persuaded to accept the pressing invitation of Marcellinus. I am at a loss how to vary the narrative of similar crimes; or how to relate, that, in the course of the same year, but in remote parts of the empire, the inhospitable table of two Imperial generals was stained with the royal blood of two guests and allies, inhumanly murdered by their order, and in their presence. The fate of Gabinius, and of Para, was the same: but the cruel death of their sovereign was resented in a very different manner by the servile temper of the Armenians, and the free and daring spirit of the Germans. The Quadi were much declined from that formidable power, which, in the time of Marcus Antoninus, had spread terror to the gates of Rome. But they still possessed arms and courage; their courage was animated by despair, and they obtained the usual reinforcement of the cavalry of their Sarmatian allies. So improvident was the assassin Marcellinus, that he chose the moment when the bravest veterans had been drawn away, to suppress the revolt of Firmus; and the whole province was exposed, with a very feeble defence, to the rage of the exasperated Barbarians. They invaded Pannonia in the season of harvest; unmercifully destroyed every object of plunder which they could not easily transport; and either disregarded, or demolished, the empty fortifications. The

[1] The Gothic war is described by Ammian. (xxvii. 5.), Zos. (l. iv. 211.), and Themis. (Orat. x. 129.). The orator Themistius was sent from the senate of Constantinople to congratulate the victorious emperor; and his servile eloquence compares Valens on the Danube, to Achilles in the Scamander. Jornandes forgets a war peculiar to the *Visi*-Goths, and inglorious to the Gothic name (Mascou's Hist. of the Germans, vii. 3.).

princess Constantia, the daughter of the emperor Constantius, and the grand-daughter of the great Constantine, very narrowly escaped. That royal maid, who had innocently supported the revolt of Procopius, was now the destined wife of the heir of the Western empire. She traversed the peaceful province with a splendid and unarmed train. Her person was saved from danger, and the republic from disgrace, by the active zeal of Messala, governor of the provinces. As soon as he was informed that the village, where she stopped only to dine, was almost encompassed by the Barbarians, he hastily placed her in his own chariot, and drove full speed till he reached the gates of Sirmium, which were at the distance of 26 miles. Even Sirmium might not have been secure, if the Quadi and Sarmatians had diligently advanced during the general consternation of the magistrates and people. Their delay allowed Probus, the Prætorian præfect, sufficient time to recover his own spirits, and to revive the courage of the citizens. He skilfully directed their strenuous efforts to repair and strengthen the decayed fortifications; and procured the seasonable and effectual assistance of a company of archers, to protect the capital of the Illyrian provinces. Disappointed in their attempts against the walls of Sirmium, the indignant Barbarians turned their arms against the master-general of the frontier, to whom they unjustly attributed the murder of their king. Equitius could bring into the field no more than two legions; but they contained the veteran strength of the Mæsian and Pannonian bands. The obstinacy with which they disputed the vain honours of rank and precedency, was the cause of their destruction; and, while they acted with separate forces and divided councils, they were surprised and slaughtered by the active vigour of the Sarmatian horse. The success of this invasion provoked the emulation of the bordering tribes; and the province of Mæsia would infallibly have been lost, if young Theodosius, the duke, or military commander, of the frontier, had not signalized, in the defeat of the public enemy, an intrepid genius, worthy of his illustrious father, and of his future greatness.[1]

The mind of Valentinian, who then resided at Treves, was deeply affected by the calamities of Illyricum; but the lateness of the season suspended the execution of his designs till the ensuing spring. He marched (A.D. 375) in person, with a considerable part of the forces of Gaul, from the banks of the Moselle: and to the suppliant ambassadors of the Sarmatians, who met him on the way, he returned a doubtful answer, that as soon as he reached the scene of action, he should examine, and pronounce. When he arrived at Sirmium, he gave audience to the deputies of the Illyrian provinces; who loudly congratulated their own felicity under the auspicious government of Probus, his Prætorian præfect.[2] Valentinian, who was flattered by these demon-

[1] Ammian. (xxix. 6.) and Zos. (l. iv. 219.) carefully mark the origin and progress of the Quadic and Sarmatian war.

[2] Ammian. (xxx. 5.) who acknowledges the merit, has censured, with becoming asperity, the oppressive administration of Petronius Probus. When Jerom translated, and continued, the Chron. of Euseb. (A.D. 380. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xii. 53. 626.), he expressed the truth, or at least the public opinion of his country, in the following words: "Probus P. P. "Illyrici iniquissimis tributorum exactionibus, ante provincias quas regebat, quam a Barbaris "vastarentur, *erasit*." (Chron. ed. Scaliger, p. 187. Animadvers. p. 259.) The Saint afterwards formed an intimate and tender friendship with the widow of Probus; and the name of

strations of their loyalty and gratitude, imprudently asked the deputy of Epirus, a Cynic philosopher of intrepid sincerity,[1] whether he was freely sent by the wishes of the province? "With tears and groans am "I sent (replied Iphicles) by a reluctant people." The emperor paused: but the impunity of his ministers established the pernicious maxim, that they might oppress his subjects, without injuring his service. A strict inquiry into their conduct would have relieved the public discontent. The severe condemnation of the murder of Gabinius, was the only measure which could restore the confidence of the Germans, and vindicate the honour of the Roman name. But the haughty monarch was incapable of the magnanimity which dares to acknowledge a fault. He forgot the provocation, remembered only the injury, and advanced into the country of the Quadi with an insatiate thirst of blood and revenge. The extreme devastation, and promiscuous massacre, of a savage war, were justified, in the eyes of the emperor, and perhaps in those of the world, by the cruel equity of retaliation:[2] and such was the discipline of the Romans, and the consternation of the enemy, that Valentinian repassed the Danube without the loss of a single man. As he had resolved to complete the destruction of the Quadi by a second campaign, he fixed his winter-quarters at Bregetio, on the Danube, near the Hungarian city of Presburgh. While the operations of war were suspended by the severity of the weather, the Quadi made an humble attempt to deprecate the wrath of their conqueror; and, at the earnest persuasion of Equitius, their ambassadors were introduced into the Imperial council. They approached the throne with bended bodies, and dejected countenances; and, without daring to complain of the murder of their king, they affirmed, with solemn oaths, that the late invasion was the crime of some irregular robbers, which the public council of the nation condemned and abhorred. The answer of the emperor left them but little to hope from his clemency or compassion. He reviled, in the most intemperate language, their baseness, their ingratitude, their insolence.—His eyes, his voice, his colour, his gestures, expressed the violence of his ungoverned fury; and, while his whole frame was agitated with convulsive passion, a large blood-vessel suddenly burst in his body; and Valentinian fell speechless into the arms of his attendants. Their pious care immediately concealed his situation from the crowd: but, in a few minutes, the emperor of the West expired in an agony of pain, retaining his senses till the last; and struggling, without success, to declare his intentions to the generals and ministers, who surrounded the royal couch. Valentinian was about fifty-four years of age; and he wanted only one hundred days to accomplish the twelve years of his reign.[3] (A.D. 375. Nov. 17.)

Count Equitius, with less propriety, but without much injustice, has been substituted in the text.

[1] Julian (Orat. vi. p. 198.) represents his friend Iphicles as a man of virtue and merit, who had made himself ridiculous and unhappy, by adopting the extravagant dress and manners of the Cynics.

[2] Ammian. xxx. 5. Jerom, who exaggerates the misfortune of Valentinian, refuses him even this last consolation of revenge. Genitali vastato solo, et *inultam* patriam derelinquens (i. 26.).

[3] See, on the death of Valentinian, Ammian. (xxx. 6.), Zos. (l. iv. 221.), Victor (in Epitom.), Soc. (l. iv. c. 31.), and Jerom (in Chron. p. 187, and i. 26. ad Heliodor.). There is much variety of circumstances among them; and Ammianus is so eloquent, that he writes nonsense.

The polygamy of Valentinian is seriously attested by an ecclesiastical historian. But we may be assured, from the evidence of reason, as well as history, that the two marriages of Valentinian, with Severa, and with Justina, were *successively* contracted; and that he used the ancient permission of divorce, which was still allowed by the laws, though it was condemned by the church. Severa was the mother of Gratian, who seemed to unite every claim which could entitle him to the undoubted succession of the Western empire. He was the eldest son of a monarch, whose glorious reign had confirmed the free and honourable choice of his fellow-soldiers. Before he had attained the ninth year of his age, the royal youth received from the hands of his indulgent father the purple robe and diadem, with the title of Augustus: the election was solemnly ratified by the consent and applause of the armies of Gaul;[1] and the name of Gratian was added to the names of Valentinian and Valens, in all the legal transactions of the Roman government. By his marriage with the grand-daughter of Constantine, the son of Valentinian acquired all the hereditary rights of the Flavian family; which, in a series of three Imperial generations, were sanctified by time, religion, and the reverence of the people. At the death of his father, the royal youth was in the seventeenth year of his age; and his virtues already justified the favourable opinion of the army and people. But Gratian resided, without apprehension, in the palace of Treves; whilst, at the distance of many hundred miles, Valentinian suddenly expired in the camp of Bregetio. The passions, which had been so long suppressed by the presence of a master, immediately revived in the Imperial council; and the ambitious design of reigning in the name of an infant, was artfully executed by Mellobaudes and Equitius, who commanded the attachment of the Illyrian and Italian bands. They contrived the most honourable pretences to remove the popular leaders, and the troops of Gaul, who might have asserted the claims of the lawful successor; they suggested the necessity of extinguishing the hopes of foreign and domestic enemies, by a bold and decisive measure. The empress Justina, who had been left in a palace about 100 miles from Bregetio, was respectfully invited to appear in the camp, with the son of the deceased emperor. On the sixth day after the death of Valentinian, the infant prince of the same name, who was only four years old, was shown, in the arms of his mother, to the legions; and solemnly invested, by military acclamation, with the titles and ensigns of supreme power. The impending dangers of a civil war were seasonably prevented by the wise and moderate conduct of the emperor Gratian. He cheerfully accepted the choice of the army; declared, that he should always consider the son of Justina as a brother, not as a rival; and advised the empress, with her son Valentinian, to fix their residence at Milan, in the fair and peaceful province of Italy; while he assumed the more arduous command of the countries beyond the Alps. Gratian dissembled his resentment till he could safely punish, or disgrace, the authors of the conspiracy; and though he uniformly behaved with tenderness and regard to his infant colleague, he gradually confounded, in the administration of the West-

[1] Ammian. (xxvii. 6.) describes the form of this military election, and *august* investiture. Valentinian does not appear to have consulted, or even informed, the senate of Rome.

ern empire, the office of a guardian with the authority of a sovereign. The government of the Roman world was exercised in the united names of Valens and his two nephews; but the feeble Emperor of the East, who succeeded to the rank of his elder brother, never obtained any weight or influence in the councils of the West.[1]

CHAPTER XXVI.

Manners of the Pastoral Nations.—Progress of the Huns, from China to Europe.—Flight of the Goths.—They pass the Danube.—Gothic War.—Defeat and Death of Valens.—Gratian invests Theodosius with the Eastern Empire.—His Character and Success.—Peace and Settlement of the Goths.

In the second year of the reign of Valentinian and Valens, on the morning of July 21, A.D. 365, the greatest part of the Roman world was shaken by a violent and destructive earthquake. The impression was communicated to the waters; the shores of the Mediterranean were left dry, by the sudden retreat of the sea; great quantities of fish were caught with the hand; large vessels were stranded on the mud; and a curious spectator[2] amused his eye, or rather his fancy, by contemplating the various appearance of valleys and mountains, which had never, since the formation of the globe, been exposed to the sun. But the tide soon returned, with the weight of an immense and irresistible deluge, which was severely felt on the coasts of Sicily, of Dalmatia, of Greece, and of Egypt: large boats were transported, and lodged on the roofs of houses, or at the distance of two miles from the shore; the people, with their habitations, were swept away by the waters; and the city of Alexandria annually commemorated the fatal day, on which 50,000 persons had lost their lives in the inundation. This calamity, the report of which was magnified from one province to another, astonished and terrified the subjects of Rome; and their affrighted imagination enlarged the real extent of a momentary evil. They recollected the preceding earthquakes, which had subverted the cities of Palestine and Bithynia: they considered these alarming strokes as the prelude only o still more dreadful calamities, and their fearful vanity was disposed to confound the symptoms of a declining empire,

[1] Ammian. xxx. 10. Zos. l. iv. 222. Tillemont has proved (Hist. des Emp. v. 707.), that Gratian *reigned* in Italy, Africa, and Illyricum. I have endeavoured to express his authority over his brother's dominions, as he used it, in an ambiguous style.

[2] Such is the bad taste of Ammian. (xxvi. 10.), that it is not easy to distinguish his facts from his metaphors. Yet he positively affirms, that he saw the rotten carcase of a ship, *ad secundum lapidem* at Methone, or Modon, in Peloponnesus.

and a sinking world.[1] It was the fashion of the times, to attribute every remarkable event to the particular will of the Deity; the alterations of nature were connected, by an invisible chain, with the moral and metaphysical opinions of the human mind; and the most sagacious divines could distinguish, according to the colour of their respective prejudices, that the establishment of heresy tended to produce an earthquake; or that a deluge was the inevitable consequence of the progress of sin and error. Without presuming to discuss the truth or propriety of these lofty speculations, the historian may content himself with an observation, which seems to be justified by experience, that man has much more to fear from the passions of his fellow-creatures, than from the convulsions of the elements.[2] The mischievous effects of an earthquake, or deluge, a hurricane, or the eruption of a volcano, bear a very inconsiderable proportion to the ordinary calamities of war; as they are now moderated by the prudence or humanity of the princes of Europe, who amuse their own leisure, and exercise the courage of their subjects, in the practice of the military art. But the laws and manners of modern nations protect the safety and freedom of the vanquished soldier; and the peaceful citizen has seldom reason to complain, that his life, or even his fortune, is exposed to the rage of war. In the disastrous period of the fall of the Roman empire, which may justly be dated from the reign of Valens, the happiness and security of each individual were personally attacked; and the arts and labours of ages were rudely defaced by the Barbarians of Scythia and Germany. The invasion of the Huns (A.D. 376) precipitated on the provinces of the West the Gothic nation, which advanced, in less than forty years, from the Danube to the Atlantic, and opened a way, by the success of their arms, to the inroads of so many hostile tribes, more savage than themselves. The original principle of motion was concealed in the remote countries of the North; and the curious observation of the pastoral life of the Scythians,[3] or Tartars,[4] will illustrate the latent cause of these destructive emigrations.

The different characters that mark the civilized nations of the globe may be ascribed to the use, and the abuse, of reason; which so variously shapes, and so artificially composes, the manners and opinions of an European, or a Chinese. But the operation of instinct is more sure and simple than that of reason: it is much easier to ascertain the appetites of a quadruped, than the speculations of a

[1] The earthquakes and inundations are variously described by Liban. (Orat. de ulcisc. Juliani nece, c. x. in Fabric. Bibl. Græc. vii. 158. with a learned note of Olearius), Zos. (l. iv. 221.), Soz. (l. vi. c. 2.), Cedrenus (p. 310.), and Jerom (in Chron. p. 186. and i. 250, in Vit. Hilarion.). Epidaurus must have been overwhelmed, had not the prudent citizens placed St. Hilarion, an Egyptian monk, on the beach. He made the sign of the cross. The mountain wave stopped, bowed, and returned.

[2] Dicæarchus, the Peripatetic, composed a formal treatise, to prove this obvious truth; which is not the most honourable to the human species (Cic. de Offic. ii. 5.).

[3] The orginal Scythians of Herodotus (l. iv. c. 47—57. 99—101.) were confined by the Danube and the Palus Mæotis, within a square of 4000 stadia (490 Roman miles). D'Anville, Mem. de l'Acad. xxxv. 573. Diod. Siculus (i. l. ii. 155. ed. Wessel.) has marked the gradual progress of the *name* and nation.

[4] The *Tatars*, or Tartars, were a primitive tribe, the rivals, and at length the subjects, of the Moguls. In the victorious armies of Zingis Khan, and his successors, the Tartars formed the vanguard; and the name, which first reached the ears of foreigners, was applied to the whole nation (Freret, Hist. de l'Acad. xviii. 60.). In speaking of all, or any, of the northern shepherds of Europe, or Asia, I indifferently use the appellations of *Scythians*, or *Tartars*.

philosopher; and the savage tribes of mankind, as they approach nearer to the condition of animals, preserve a stronger resemblance to themselves and to each other. The uniform stability of their manners, is the natural consequence of the imperfection of their faculties. Reduced to a similar situation, their wants, their desires, their enjoyments, still continue the same: and the influence of food or climate, which, in a more improved state of society, is suspended, or subdued, by so many moral causes, most powerfully contributes to form, and to maintain, the national character of Barbarians. In every age, the immense plains of Scythia, or Tartary, have been inhabited by vagrant tribes of hunters and shepherds, whose indolence refuses to cultivate the earth, and whose restless spirit disdains the confinement of a sedentary life. In every age the Scythians, and Tartars, have been renowned for their invincible courage, and rapid conquests. The thrones of Asia have been repeatedly overturned by the shepherds of the North; and their arms have spread terror and devastation over the most fertile and warlike countries of Europe.[1] On this occasion, as well as on many others, the sober historian is forcibly awakened from a pleasing vision; and is compelled, with some reluctance, to confess, that the pastoral manners, which have been adorned with the fairest attributes of peace and innocence, are much better adapted to the fierce and cruel habits of a military life. To illustrate this observation, I shall now proceed to consider a nation of shepherds and of warriors, in the three important articles of, I. Their diet; II. Their habitation; and, III. Their exercises. The narratives of antiquity are justified by the experience of modern times;[2] and the banks of the Borysthenes, of the Volga, or of the Selinga, will indifferently present the same uniform spectacle of similar and native manners.[3]

I. The corn, or even the rice, which constitutes the ordinary and wholesome food of a civilized people, can be obtained only by the patient toil of the husbandman. Some of the happy savages, who dwell between the tropics, are plentifully nourished by the liberality of nature; but in the climates of the North, a nation of shepherds is reduced to their flocks and herds. The skilful practitioners of the medical art will determine (if they are able to determine) how far the temper of the human mind may be affected by the use of animal, or of vegetable, food; and whether the common association of carnivorous and cruel, deserves to be considered in any other light than that of an innocent, perhaps a salutary, prejudice of humanity.[4] Yet if it be true,

[1] Imperium Asiæ *ter* quæsivere: ipsi perpetuo ab alieno Imperio, aut intacti, aut invicti, mansere. Since the time of Justin (ii. 2.), they have multiplied this account. Voltaire, in a few words (x. p. 64. Hist. Gen. c. 156.), has abridged the Tartar conquests.

Oft o'er the trembling nations, from afar, Has Scythia breath'd the living cloud of war.

[2] Herodotus, Book iv. affords a curious, though imperfect, portrait of the Scythians. Among the moderns, who describe the uniform scene, the Khan of Khowaresm, Abulghazi Bahadur, expresses his native feelings; and his Genealogical History of the *Tatars* has been copiously illustrated by the French and English editors. Carpin, Ascelin, and Rubruquis (Hist. des Voyages, vii.), represent the Moguls of the fourteenth century. To these guides I have added Gerbillon, and the other Jesuits (Descrip. de la Chine, par du Halde, iv.), who accurately surveyed the Chinese Tartary; and that honest and intelligent traveller Bell, of Antermony (two vols. 4to. Glasgow, 1763.).

[3] The Uzbecks are the most altered from their primitive manners; 1. by the profession of the Mahometan religion; and, 2. by the possession of the cities and harvests of the great Bucharia.

[4] Il est certain que les grands mangeurs de viande sont en general cruels et feroces plus que

that the sentiment of compassion is imperceptibly weakened by the sight and practice of domestic cruelty, we may observe, that the horrid objects which are disguised by the arts of European refinement, are exhibited in their naked and most disgusting simplicity, in the tent of a Tartarian shepherd. The ox, or the sheep, are slaughtered by the same hand from which they were accustomed to receive their daily food ; and the bleeding limbs are served, with very little preparation, on the table of their unfeeling murderer. In the military profession, and especially in the conduct of a numerous army, the exclusive use of animal food appears to be productive of the most solid advantages. Corn is a bulky and perishable commodity ; and the large magazines, which are indispensably necessary for the subsistence of our troops, must be slowly transported by the labour of men, or horses. But the flocks and herds, which accompany the march of the Tartars, afford a sure and increasing supply of flesh and milk : in the far greater part of the uncultivated waste the vegetation of the grass is quick and luxuriant ; and there are few places so extremely barren, that the hardy cattle of the North cannot find some tolerable pasture. The supply is multiplied and prolonged, by the undistinguishing appetite, and patient abstinence, of the Tartars. They indifferently feed on the flesh of those animals that have been killed for the table, or have died of disease. Horse-flesh, which in every age and country has been proscribed by the civilized nations of Europe and Asia, they devour with peculiar greediness ; and this singular taste facilitates the success of their military operations. The active cavalry of Scythia is always followed, in their most distant and rapid incursions, by an adequate number of spare horses, who may be occasionally used, either to redouble the speed, or to satisfy the hunger, of the Barbarians. Many are the resources of courage and poverty. When the forage round a camp of Tartars is almost consumed, they slaughter the greatest part of their cattle, and preserve the flesh, either smoked, or dried in the sun. On the sudden emergency of a hasty march, they provide themselves with a sufficient quantity of little balls of cheese, or rather of hard curd, which they occasionally dissolve in water ; and this unsubstantial diet will support, for many days, the life, and even the spirits, of the patient warrior. But this extraordinary abstinence, which the Stoic would approve, and the hermit might envy, is commonly succeeded by the most voracious indulgence of appetite. The wines of a happier climate are the most grateful present, or the most valuable commodity, that can be offered to the Tartars ; and the only example of their industry seems to consist in the art of extracting from mare's milk a fermented liquor, which possesses a very strong power of intoxication. Like the animals of prey, the savages, both of the old and new world, experience the alternate vicissitudes of famine and plenty ; and their stomach is inured to sustain, without much inconvenience, the opposite extremes of hunger and of intemperance.

les autres hommes. Cette observation est de touts les lieux, et de touts les tems : la barbare Angloise est connue, &c. Emile de Rousseau, i. 274. Whatever we may think of the general observation, *we* shall not easily allow the truth of his example. The good-natured complaints of Plutarch, and the pathetic lamentations of Ovid, seduce our reason, by exciting our sensibility.

II. In the ages of rustic and martial simplicity, a people of soldiers and husbandmen are dispersed over the face of an extensive and cultivated country; and some time must elapse before the warlike youth of Greece or Italy could be assembled under the same standard, either to defend their own confines, or to invade the territories of the adjacent tribes. The progress of manufactures and commerce insensibly collects a large multitude within the walls of a city; but these citizens are no longer soldiers; and the arts which adorn and improve the state of civil society, corrupt the habits of the military life. The pastoral manners of the Scythians seem to unite the different advantages of simplicity and refinement. The individuals of the same tribe are constantly assembled, but they are assembled in a camp; and the native spirit of these dauntless shepherds is animated by mutual support and emulation. The houses of the Tartars are no more than small tents, of an oval form, which afford a cold and dirty habitation for the promiscuous youth of both sexes. The palaces of the rich consist of wooden huts, of such a size that they may be conveniently fixed on large waggons, and drawn by a team perhaps of 20 or 30 oxen. The flocks and herds, after grazing all day in the adjacent pastures, retire, on the approach of night, within the protection of the camp. The necessity of preventing the most mischievous confusion, in such a perpetual concourse of men and animals, must gradually introduce, in the distribution, the order, and the guard, of the encampment, the rudiments of the military art. As soon as the forage of a certain district is consumed, the tribe, or rather army, of shepherds, makes a regular march to some fresh pastures; and thus acquires, in the ordinary occupations of the pastoral life, the practical knowledge of one of the most important and difficult operations of war. The choice of stations is regulated by the difference of the seasons: in the summer, the Tartars advance towards the North, and pitch their tents on the banks of a river, or, at least, in the neighbourhood of a running stream. But in the winter they return to the South, and shelter their camp, behind some convenient eminence, against the winds, which are chilled in their passage over the bleak and icy regions of Siberia. These manners are admirably adapted to diffuse, among the wandering tribes, the spirit of emigration and conquest. The connexion between the people and their territory is of so frail a texture, that it may be broken by the slightest accident. The camp, and not the soil, is the native country of the genuine Tartar. Within the precincts of that camp, his family, his companions, his property are always included; and in the most distant marches, he is still surrounded by the objects which are dear, or valuable, or familiar in his eyes. The thirst of rapine, the fear or the resentment of injury, the impatience of servitude, have, in every age, been sufficient causes to urge the tribes of Scythia boldly to advance into some unknown countries, where they might hope to find a more plentiful subsistence, or a less formidable enemy. The revolutions of the North have frequently determined the fate of the South; and in the conflict of hostile nations, the victor and the vanquished have alternately drove, and been driven, from the confines of China to those of Germany.[1] These great emigrations, which

[1] These Tartar emigrations have been discovered by M. de Guignes (Hist. des Huns. i. ii.)

have been sometimes executed with almost incredible diligence, were rendered more easy by the peculiar nature of the climate. It is well known, that the cold of Tartary is much more severe than in the midst of the temperate zone might reasonably be expected: this uncommon rigour is attributed to the height of the plains, which rise, especially towards the East, more than half a mile above the level of the sea; and to the quantity of saltpetre, with which the soil is deeply impregnated.[1] In the winter season, the broad and rapid rivers, that discharge their waters into the Euxine, the Caspian, or the Icy Sea, are strongly frozen; the fields are covered with a bed of snow; and the fugitive, or victorious, tribes may securely traverse, with their families, their waggons, and their cattle, the smooth and hard surface of an immense plain.

III. The pastoral life, compared with the labours of agriculture and manufactures, is undoubtedly a life of idleness; and as the most honourable shepherds of the Tartar race devolve on their captives the domestic management of the cattle, their own leisure is seldom disturbed by any servile and assiduous cares. But this leisure, instead of being devoted to the soft enjoyments of love and harmony, is usefully spent in the violent and sanguinary exercise of the chace. The plains of Tartary are filled with a strong and serviceable breed of horses, which are easily trained for the purposes of war and hunting. The Scythians of every age have been celebrated as bold and skilful riders: and constant practice had seated them so firmly on horseback, that they were supposed by strangers to perform the ordinary duties of civil life, to eat, to drink, and even to sleep, without dismounting from their steeds. They excel in the dexterous management of the lance; the long Tartar bow is drawn with a nervous arm; and the weighty arrow is directed to its object with unerring aim, and irresistible force. These arrows are often pointed against the harmless animals of the desert, which increase and multiply in the absence of their most formidable enemy; the hare, the goat, the roebuck, the fallow-deer, the stag, the elk, and the antelope. The vigour and patience both of the men and horses are continually exercised by the fatigues of the chace; and the plentiful supply of game contributes to the subsistence, and even luxury, of a Tartar camp. But the exploits of the hunters of Scythia are not confined to the destruction of timid or innoxious beasts; they boldly encounter the angry wild-boar, when he turns against his pursuers, excite the sluggish courage of the bear, and provoke the fury of the tiger, as he slumbers in the thicket. Where there is danger, there may be glory: and the mode of hunting, which opens the fairest field to the exertions of valour, may justly be considered as the image, and as the school, of war. The general hunting-matches, the pride and delight of the Tartar princes, compose an instructive exercise for their numerous cavalry. A circle is drawn, of many miles in circumfer-

a skilful and laborious interpreter of the Chinese language; who has thus laid open new and important scenes in the history of mankind.

[1] A plain in the Chinese Tartary, only 80 leagues from the great wall, was found by the missionaries to be 3000 geometrical paces above the level of the sea. Montesquieu, who has used, and abused, the relations of travellers, deduces the revolutions of Asia from this important circumstance, that heat and cold, weakness and strength, touch each other without any temperate zone (Esprit des Loix, l. xvii. c. 3.).

ence, to encompass the game of an extensive district; and the troops that form the circle regularly advance towards a common centre; where the captive animals, surrounded on every side, are abandoned to the darts of the hunters. In this march, which frequently continues many days, the cavalry are obliged to climb the hills, to swim the rivers, and to wind through the valleys, without interrupting the prescribed order of their gradual progress. They acquire the habit of directing their eye, and their steps, to a remote object; of preserving their intervals; of suspending, or accelerating, their pace, according to the motions of the troops on their right and left; and of watching and repeating the signals of their leaders. Their leaders study, in this practical school, the most important lesson of the military art; the prompt and accurate judgment of ground, of distance, and of time. To employ against a human enemy the same patience and valour, the same skill and discipline, is the only alteration which is required in real war; and the amusements of the chace serve as a prelude to the conquest of an empire.[1]

The political society of the ancient Germans has the appearance of a voluntary alliance of independent warriors. The tribes of Scythia, distinguished by the modern appellation of *Hords*, assume the form of a numerous and increasing family; which, in the course of successive generations, has been propagated from the same original stock. The meanest, and most ignorant, of the Tartars, preserve, with conscious pride, the inestimable treasure of their genealogy; and whatever distinctions of rank may have been introduced, by the unequal distribution of pastoral wealth, they mutually respect themselves, and each other, as the descendants of the first founder of the tribe. The custom, which still prevails, of adopting the bravest and most faithful of the captives, may countenance the very probable suspicion, that this extensive consanguinity is, in a great measure, legal and fictitious. But the useful prejudice, which has obtained the sanction of time and opinion, produces the effects of truth; the haughty Barbarians yield a cheerful and voluntary obedience to the head of their blood; and their chief, or *mursa*, as the representative of their great father, exercises the authority of a judge, in peace, and of a leader, in war. In the original state of the pastoral world, each of the *mursas* (if we may continue to use a modern appellation) acted as the independent chief of a large and separate family; and the limits of their peculiar territories were gradually fixed, by superior force, or mutual consent. But the constant operation of various and permanent causes contributed to unite the vagrant Hords into national communities, under the command of a supreme head. The weak were desirous of support, and the strong were ambitious of dominion; the power, which is the result of union, oppressed and collected the divided forces of the adjacent tribes; and, as the vanquished were freely admitted to share the advantages of victory, the most valiant chiefs hastened to range them-

[1] Petit de la Croix (Vie de Gengiscan, l. iii. c. 7.) represents the full glory and extent of the Mogul chace. The Jesuits Gerbillon and Verbiest followed the emperor Kamhi when he hunted in Tartary (Duhalde, Descrip. de la Chine, iv. 81. 290. fol. ed.). His grandson, Kienlong, who unites the Tartar discipline with the laws and learning of China, describes (Eloge de Monkden, p. 273—285.), as a poet, the pleasures which he had often enjoyed, as a sportsman.

selves, and their followers, under the formidable standard of a confederate nation. The most successful of the Tartar princes assumed the military command, to which he was entitled by the superiority, either of merit, or of power.

He was raised to the throne by the acclamations of his equals; and the title of *Khan* expresses, in the language of the North of Asia, the full extent of the regal dignity. The right of hereditary succession was long confined to the blood of the founder of the monarchy; and at this moment all the Khans, who reign from Crimea to the wall of China, are the lineal descendants of the renowned Zingis.[1] But, as it is the indispensable duty of a Tartar sovereign to lead his warlike subjects into the field, the claims of an infant are often disregarded; and some royal kinsman, distinguished by his age and valour, is entrusted with the sword and sceptre of his predecessor. Two distinct and regular taxes are levied on the tribes, to support the dignity of their national monarch, and of their peculiar chief; and each of those contributions amounts to the tithe, both of their property, and of their spoil. A Tartar sovereign enjoys the tenth part of the wealth of his people: and as his own domestic riches of flocks and herds increase in a much larger proportion, he is able plentifully to maintain the rustic splendour of his court, to reward the most deserving, or the most favoured, of his followers, and to obtain, from the gentle influence of corruption, the obedience which might be sometimes refused to the stern mandates of authority. The manners of his subjects, accustomed, like himself, to blood and rapine, might excuse, in their eyes, such partial acts of tyranny, as would excite the horror of a civilized people; but the power of a despot has never been acknowledged in the deserts of Scythia. The immediate jurisdiction of the Khan is confined within the limits of his own tribe; and the exercise of his royal prerogative has been moderated by the ancient institution of a national council. The Coroultai,[2] or Diet, of the Tartars, was regularly held in the spring and autumn, in the midst of a plain; where the princes of the reigning family, and the mursas of the respective tribes, may conveniently assemble on horseback, with their martial and numerous trains; and the ambitious monarch, who reviewed the strength, must consult the inclination, of an armed people. The rudiments of a feudal government may be discovered in the constitution of the Scythian or Tartar nations; but the perpetual conflict of those hostile nations has sometimes terminated in the establishment of a powerful and despotic empire. The victor, enriched by the tribute, and fortified by the arms, of dependent kings, has spread his conquests over Europe or Asia; the successful shepherds of the North have submitted to the confinement of arts, of laws, and of cities; and the in-

[1] Second volume of the Genealog. Hist. of the Tartars: and the list of the Khans, at the end of the Life of Gengis, or Zingis. Under the reign of Timur, or Tamerlane, one of his subjects, a descendant of Zingis, still bore the regal appellation of Khan; and the conqueror of Asia contented himself with the title of Emir, or Sultan. Abulghazi, part v. c. 4. D'Herbelot, Biblio. Orient. p. 878.

[2] See Diets of the ancient Huns (de Guignes, ii. 26.), and a curious description of those of Zingis (Vie de Gengiscan, l. i. c. 6. l. iv. c. 11.). Such assemblies are frequently mentioned in the Persian history of Timur; though they served only to countenance the resolutions of their master.

troduction of luxury, after destroying the freedom of the people, has undermined the foundations of the throne.[1]

The memory of past events cannot long be preserved, in the frequent and remote emigrations of illiterate Barbarians. The modern Tartars are ignorant of the conquests of their ancestors;[2] and our knowledge of the history of the Scythians is derived from their intercourse with the learned and civilized nations of the South, the Greeks, the Persians, and the Chinese. The Greeks, who navigated the Euxine, and planted their colonies along the sea-coast, made the gradual and imperfect discovery of Scythia; from the Danube, and the confines of Thrace, as far as the frozen Mæotis, the seat of eternal winter, and Mount Caucasus, which, in the language of poetry, was described as the utmost boundary of the earth. They celebrated, with simple credulity, the virtues of the pastoral life:[3] they entertained a more rational apprehension of the strength and numbers of the warlike Barbarians (*Thucydides*, l. ii. c. 97), who contemptuously baffled the immense armament of Darius, the son of Hystaspes.[4] The Persian monarchs had extended their western conquests to the banks of the Danube, and the limits of European Scythia. The eastern provinces of their empire were exposed to the Scythians of Asia; the wild inhabitants of the plains beyond the Oxus and the Jaxartes, two mighty rivers, which direct their course towards the Caspian Sea. The long and memorable quarrel of Iran and Touran, is still the theme of history or romance: the famous, perhaps the fabulous, valour of the Persian heroes, Rustan and Asfendiar, was signalized, in the defence of their country against the Afrasiabs of the North;[5] and the invincible spirit of the same Barbarians resisted, on the same ground, the victorious arms of Cyrus and Alexander.[6] In the eyes of the Greeks and Persians, the real geography of Scythia was bounded, on the East, by the mountains of Imaus, or Caf; and their distant prospect of the extreme and inaccessible parts of Asia was clouded by ignorance, or perplexed by fiction. But those inaccessible regions are the ancient residence of a powerful and civilized nation,[7] which ascends, by a probable tradition,

[1] Montesquieu labours to explain a difference, which has not existed, between the liberty of the Arabs, and the *perpetual* slavery of the Tartars (Esprit des Loix, l. xvii. c. 5. l. xviii. c. 19, &c.).

[2] Abulghazi Khan, in the two first parts of his genealogical History, relates the miserable fables and traditions of the Uzbek Tartars concerning the times which preceded the reign of Zingis.

[3] In the Iliad, Book xiii., Jupiter turns away his eyes from the bloody fields of Troy, to the plains of Thrace and Scythia. He would not, by changing the prospect, behold a more peaceful or innocent scene.

[4] Herodotus, Book iv. When Darius advanced into the Moldavian desert, between the Danube and the Niester, the king of the Scythians sent him a mouse, a frog, a bird, and five arrows; a tremendous allegory!

[5] These wars and heroes may be found, under their respective *titles*, in the Biblio. Orient. of d'Herbelot. They have been celebrated in an epic poem of 60,000 rhymed couplets, by Ferdusi, the Homer of Persia. Hist. of Nader Shah, p. 145. 165. The public must lament, that Mr. Jones has suspended the pursuit of Oriental learning.

[6] The Caspian Sea, with its rivers, and adjacent tribes, are laboriously illustrated in the Examen Critiq. des Hist. d'Alexandre, which compares the true geography, and the errors produced by the vanity or ignorance of the Greeks.

[7] The original seat of the nation appears to have been in the North-west of China, in the provinces of Chensi and Chansi. Under the two first dynasties, the principal town was still a movable camp; the villages were thinly scattered; more land was employed in pasture than in tillage; the exercise of hunting was ordained to clear the country from wild beasts; Petcheli (where Pekin stands) was a desert; and the southern provinces were peopled with In-

above forty centuries;[1] and which is able to verify a series of near 2000 years, by the perpetual testimony of accurate and contemporary historians.[2] The annals of China[3] illustrate the state and revolutions of the pastoral tribes, which may still be distinguished by the vague appellation of Scythians, or Tartars; the vassals, the enemies, and sometimes the conquerors, of a great empire; whose policy has uniformly opposed the blind and impetuous valour of the Barbarians of the North. From the mouth of the Danube to the sea of Japan, the whole longitude of Scythia is about 110 degrees, which in that parallel, aré equal to more than 5000 miles. The latitude of these extensive deserts cannot be so easily, or so accurately, measured; but, from the fortieth degree, which touches the wall of China, we may securely advance above 1000 miles to the northward, till our progress is stopped by the excessive cold of Siberia. In that dreary climate, instead of the animated picture of a Tartar camp, the smoke which issues from the earth, or rather from the snow, betrays the subterraneous dwellings of the Tongouses, and the Samoiedes: the want of horses and oxen is imperfectly supplied by the use of rein-deer, and of large dogs; and the conquerors of the earth insensibly degenerate into a race of deformed and diminutive savages, who tremble at the sound of arms.—*Hist. Gen. des Voyag.* xviii. *Genealog. Hist.* ii. 620.

The Huns, who under the reign of Valens threatened the empire of Rome, had been formidable, in a much earlier period, to the empire of China.[4] Their ancient, perhaps their original, seat, was an extensive, though dry and barren, tract of country, immediately on the north side of the great wall. Their place is at present occupied by the 49 Hords or Banners of the Mongous, a pastoral nation, which consists of about 200,000 families.[5] But the valour of the Huns had extended the narrow limits of their dominions; and their rustic chiefs, who assumed the appellation of *Tanjou*, gradually became the con-

dian savages. The dynasty of the *Han* (before Christ 206.) gave the empire its actual form and extent.

[1] The æra of the Chinese monarchy has been variously fixed, from 2952 to 2132 years before Christ; and the year 2637 has been chosen for the lawful epoch, by the authority of the present emperor. The difference arises from the uncertain duration of the two first dynasties; and the vacant space that lies beyond them, as far as the real, or fabulous, times of Fohi, or Hoangti. Sematsien dates his authentic chronology from the year 841: the 36 eclipses of Confucius (31 of which have been verified) were observed between the years 722 and 480 before Christ. The *historical period* of China does not ascend above the Greek Olympiads.

[2] After several ages of anarchy and despotism, the dynasty of the Han (before Christ 206.) was the æra of the revival of learning. The fragments of ancient literature were restored; the characters were improved and fixed; and the future preservation of books was secured, by the useful inventions of ink, paper, and the art of printing. Ninety-seven years before Christ, Sematsien published the first history of China. His labours were illustrated, and continued, by a series of 180 historians. The substance of their works is still extant; and the most considerable of them are now deposited in the king of France's library.

[3] China has been illustrated by the labours of the French; of the missionaries at Pekin, and Messrs. Freret and De Guignes at Paris. The substance of the three preceding notes is extracted from The *Chou-king*, with the preface and notes of M. de Guignes, Paris, 1770: The *Tong-Kien-Kang-Mou*, translated by the P. de Mailla, under the name of Hist. Gen. de la Chine, i. xlix—cc.; Mem. sur la Chine, Paris, 1776, &c. i. p. 1—323. tom. ii. p. 5—364.; Hist. des Huns, i. p. 1—131. v. p. 345—362.; and Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip., x. 377. xv. 495. xviii. 178. xxxvi. 164.

[4] M. de Guignes (ii. 1—124.) has given the original history of the ancient Hiong-nou, or Huns. The Chinese geography of their country (i. part ii. p. lv—lxiii.), seems to comprise a part of their conquests.

[5] See in Duhalde (iv. 18.) a circumstantial description, with a correct map, of the country of the Mongous.

querors, and the sovereigns, of a formidable empire. Towards the East, their victorious arms were stopped only by the ocean; and the tribes, which are thinly scattered between the Amoor and the extreme peninsula of Corea, adhered, with reluctance, to the standard of the Huns. On the West, near the head of the Irtish, and in the valleys of Imaus, they found a more ample space, and more numerous enemies. One of the lieutenants of the Tanjou subdued, in a single expedition, twenty-six nations; the Igours,[1] distinguished above the Tartar race by the use of letters, were in the number of his vassals; and, by the strange connexion of human events, the flight of one of those vagrant tribes recalled the victorious Parthians from the invasion of Syria.[2] On the side of the North, the ocean was assigned as the limit of the power of the Huns. Without enemies to resist their progress, or witnesses to contradict their vanity, they might securely achieve a real, or imaginary, conquest of the frozen regions of Siberia. The *Northern Sea* was fixed as the remote boundary of their empire. But the name of that sea, on whose shores the patriot Sovou embraced the life of a shepherd and an exile,[3] may be transferred, with much more probability, to the Baikal, a capacious bason, above 300 miles in length, which disdains the modest appellation of a lake,[4] and which actually communicates with the seas of the North, by the long course of the Angara, the Tonguska, and the Jenissea. The submission of so many distant nations might flatter the pride of the Tanjou; but the valour of the Huns could be rewarded only by the enjoyment of the wealth and luxury of the empire of the South. In the third century before the Christian æra, a wall of 1500 miles in length was constructed, to defend the frontiers of China against the inroads of the Huns;[5] but this stupendous work, which holds a conspicuous place in the map of the world, has never contributed to the safety of an unwarlike people. The cavalry of the Tanjou frequently consisted of 200,000 or 300,000 men, formidable by the matchless dexterity with which they managed their bows and their horses; by their hardy patience in supporting the inclemency of the weather; and by the incredible speed of their march, which was seldom checked by torrents, or precipices, by the deepest rivers, or by the most lofty mountains. They spread themselves at once over the face of the country; and their rapid impetuosity surprised, astonished, and disconcerted (A.C. 201) the grave and elaborate tactics of a Chinese army. The emperor Kaoti,[6] a soldier of fortune, whose personal merit had

[1] The Igours, or Vigours, were divided into three branches; hunters, shepherds, and husbandmen; and the last class was despised by the two former. Abulghazi, part ii. c. 7.

[2] Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. xxv. 17. The comprehensive view of M. de Guignes has compared these distant events.

[3] The fame of Sovou, or So-ou, his merit, and his singular adventures, are still celebrated in China. Eloge de Monkden, p. 20. and notes, 241.; and Mem. sur la Chine, iii. 317.

[4] Isbrand Ives, in Harris's collection, ii. 931; Bell's Travels, i. 247; and Gmelin, in the Hist. Gen. des Voyages, xviii. 283. They all remark the vulgar opinion, that the *holy sea* grows angry and tempestuous, if any one presumes to call it a *lake*. This grammatical nicety often excites a dispute, between the absurd superstition of the mariners, and the absurd obstinacy of travellers.

[5] The construction of the wall of China is mentioned by Duhalde (ii. 45.) and de Guignes (ii. 59.).

[6] Life of Lieoupang, or Kaoti, in the Hist. de la Chine, Paris, 1777, i. 442. This voluminous work is the translation (by the P. de Mailla) of the *Tong-Kien-Kang-Mou*, the celebrated abridgment of the great History of Semakouang (A.D. 1084.) and his continuators.

raised him to the throne, marched against the Huns with those veteran troops which had been trained in the civil wars of China. But he was soon surrounded by the Barbarians; and, after a siege of seven days, the monarch, hopeless of relief, was reduced to purchase his deliverance by an ignominious capitulation. The successors of Kaoti, whose lives were dedicated to the arts of peace, or the luxury of the palace, submitted to a more permanent disgrace. They too hastily confessed the insufficiency of arms and fortifications. They were too easily convinced, that while the blazing signals announced on every side the approach of the Huns, the Chinese troops, who slept with the helmet on their head, and the cuirass on their back, were destroyed by the incessant labour of ineffectual marches.[1] A regular payment of money, and silk, was stipulated as the condition of a temporary and precarious peace; and the wretched expedient of disguising a real tribute, under the names of a gift or a subsidy, was practised by the emperors of China, as well as by those of Rome. But there still remained a more disgraceful article of tribute, which violated the sacred feelings of humanity and nature. The hardships of the savage life, which destroy in their infancy the children who are born with a less healthy and robust constitution, introduce a remarkable disproportion between the numbers of the two sexes. The Tartars are an ugly, and even deformed race; and, while they consider their own women as the instruments of domestic labour, their desires, or rather their appetites, are directed to the enjoyment of more elegant beauty. A select band of the fairest maidens of China was annually devoted to the rude embraces of the Huns;[2] and the alliance of the haughty Tanjous was secured by their marriage with the genuine, or adopted, daughters of the Imperial family, which vainly attempted to escape the sacrilegious pollution. The situation of these unhappy victims is described in the verses of a Chinese princess, who laments that she had been condemned by her parents to a distant exile, under a Barbarian husband; who complains that sour milk was her only drink, raw flesh her only food, a tent her only palace; and who expresses, in a strain of pathetic simplicity, the natural wish, that she were transformed into a bird, to fly back to her dear country; the object of her tender and perpetual regret.—*De Guignes, Hist. des Huns*, ii. 62.

The conquest of China has been twice achieved by the pastoral tribes of the North: the forces of the Huns were not inferior to those of the Moguls, or of the Mantcheoux; and their ambition might entertain the most sanguine hopes of success. But their pride was humbled, and their progress was checked, by the arms and policy of Vouti,[3] the fifth emperor of the powerful dynasty of the Han. In his long reign of fifty-four years (A.C. 141—87), the Barbarians of the southern provinces submitted to the laws and manners of China: and

[1] Memorial, presented by a Mandarin to the emperor Venti (before Christ 180—157), Duhalde (ii. 412.); from a collection of State papers, marked with the red pencil by Kamhi himself (p. 384—612.). Another memorial from the minister of war (Kang-Mou, ii. 555.) supplies some curious circumstances of the manners of the Huns.

[2] A supply of women is mentioned as a customary article of treaty and tribute (Hist. de la Conq. de la Chine, par les Tartares Mantcheoux, i. 186, with the note of the editor).

[3] See the reign of the emperor Vouti, in the Kang-Mou, iii. 1—98. His various and inconsistent character seems to be impartially drawn.

the ancient limits of the monarchy were enlarged, from the great river of Kiang, to the port of Canton. Instead of confining himself to the timid operations of a defensive war, his lieutenants penetrated many hundred miles into the country of the Huns. In those boundless deserts, where it is impossible to form magazines, and difficult to transport a sufficient supply of provisions, the armies of Vouti were repeatedly exposed to intolerable hardships: and, of 140,000 soldiers, who marched against the Barbarians, 30,000 only returned in safety to the feet of their master. These losses, however, were compensated by splendid and decisive success. The Chinese generals improved the superiority which they derived from the temper of their arms, their chariots of war, and the service of their Tartar auxiliaries. The camp of the Tanjou was surprised in the midst of sleep and intemperance: and, though the monarch of the Huns bravely cut his way through the ranks of the enemy, he left above 15,000 of his subjects on the field of battle. Yet this signal victory, which was preceded and followed by many bloody engagements, contributed much less to the destruction of the power of the Huns, than the effectual policy which was employed to detach the tributary nations from their obedience. Intimidated by the arms, or allured by the promises, of Vouti and his successors, the most considerable tribes, both of the East and of the West, disclaimed (A.C. 70) the authority of the Tanjou. While some acknowledged themselves the allies or vassals of the empire, they all became the implacable enemies of the Huns: and the numbers of that haughty people, as soon as they were reduced to their native strength, might, perhaps, have been contained within the walls of one of the great and populous cities of China.[1] The desertion of his subjects, and the perplexity of a civil war, at length compelled the Tanjou himself to renounce the dignity of an independent sovereign, and the freedom of a warlike and high-spirited nation. He was received (A.C. 51) at Sigan, the capital of the monarchy, by the troops, the Mandarins, and the emperor himself, with all the honours that could adorn and disguise the triumph of Chinese vanity.[2] A magnificent palace was prepared for his reception; his place was assigned above all the princes of the royal family; and the patience of the Barbarian king was exhausted by the ceremonies of a banquet, which consisted of eight courses of meat, and of nine solemn pieces of music. But he performed, on his knees, the duty of a respectful homage to the emperor of China; pronounced, in his own name, and in the name of his successors, a perpetual oath of fidelity; and gratefully accepted a seal, which was bestowed as the emblem of his regal dependence. After this humiliating submission, the Tanjous sometimes departed from their allegiance, and seized the favourable moments of war and rapine; but the monarchy of the Huns gradually declined, till it was broken, by civil dissension (A.D. 48), into two hostile and separate

[1] This expression is used in the memorial to the emperor Venti (Duhalde, ii. 417.). Without adopting the exaggerations of Marco-Polo and Isaac Vossius, we may rationally allow for Pekin, two millions of inhabitants. The cities of the South, which contain the manufactures of China, are still more populous.

[2] Kang-Mou, iii. 150., and the subsequent events under the proper years. This memorable festival is celebrated in the Eloge de Moukden, and explained in a note by the P. Gaubil, p. 89.

kingdoms. One of the princes of the nation was urged, by fear and ambition, to retire towards the South with eight hords, which composed between 40,000 and 50,000 families. He obtained, with the title of Tanjou, a convenient territory on the verge of the Chinese provinces; and his constant attachment to the service of the empire, was secured by weakness, and the desire of revenge. From the time of this fatal schism, the Huns of the North continued to languish about fifty years; till they were oppressed on every side by their foreign and domestic enemies. The proud inscription[1] of a column, erected on a lofty mountain, announced to posterity, that a Chinese army had marched 700 miles into the heart of their country. The Sienpi,[2] a tribe of Oriental Tartars, retaliated the injuries which they had formerly sustained; and the power of the Tanjous, after a reign of 1300 years, was (A.D. 93) utterly destroyed before the end of the first century of the Christian æra.[3]

The fate of the vanquished Huns was diversified by the various influence of character and situation.[4] Above 100,000 persons, the poorest, indeed, and the most pusillanimous, of the people, were contented to remain in their native country, to renounce their peculiar name and origin, and to mingle with the victorious nation of the Sienpi. Fifty-eight hords, about 200,000 men (A. D. 100, &c.), ambitious of a more honourable servitude, retired towards the South; implored the protection of the emperors of China; and were permitted to inhabit, and to guard, the extreme frontiers of the province of Chansi and the territory of Ortous. But the most warlike and powerful tribes of the Huns maintained, in their adverse fortune, the undaunted spirit of their ancestors. The western world was open to their valour; and they resolved, under the conduct of their hereditary chieftains, to discover and subdue some remote country, which was still inaccessible to the arms of the Sienpi, and to the laws of China.[5] The course of their emigration soon carried them beyond the mountains of Imaus, and the limits of the Chinese geography; but *we* are able to distinguish the two great divisions of these formidable exiles, which directed their march towards the Oxus, and towards the Volga. The first of these colonies established their dominion in the fruitful and extensive plains of Sogdiana, on the Eastern side of the Caspian: where they preserved the name of Huns, with the epithet of Euthalites, or Nepthalites. Their manners were softened, and even their features were insensibly improved, by the mildness of the climate, and their long residence in a flourishing province,[6] which might still retain a faint impression of

[1] This inscription was composed on the spot by Pankou, President of the Tribunal of History (Kang-Mou, iii. 392.). Similar monuments have been discovered in many parts of Tartary (Hist. des Huns, ii. 122.).

[2] M. de Guignes (i. 189.) has inserted a short account of the Sienpi.

[3] The æra of the Huns is placed, by the Chinese, 1210 years before Christ. But the series of their kings does not commence till the year 230. (Hist. des Huns, ii. 21. 123.)

[4] The various accidents of the downfall and flight of the Huns, are related in the Kang-Mou, iii. 88. 139. The small numbers of each hord may be ascribed to their losses and divisions.

[5] M. de Guignes has skilfully traced the footsteps of the Huns through the vast deserts of Tartary (ii. 123. 277, 325, &c.).

[6] Mohammed, Sultan of Carizme, reigned in Sogdiana, when it was invaded (A.D. 1218.) by Zingis and his Moguls. The Oriental historians (d'Herbelot, Petit de la Croix, &c.) celebrate the populous cities which he ruined, and the fruitful country which he desolated. In

the arts of Greece.[1] The *white* Huns, a name which they derived from the change of their complexions, soon abandoned the pastoral life of Scythia. Gorgo, which, under the appellation of Carizme, has since enjoyed a temporary splendour, was the residence of the king, who exercised a legal authority over an obedient people. Their luxury was maintained by the labour of the Sogdians; and the only vestige of their ancient barbarism, was the custom which obliged all the companions, perhaps to the number of twenty, who had shared the liberality of a wealthy lord, to be buried alive in the same grave.—*Procop. de Bell. Persico*, l. i. c. 3. p. 9. The vicinity of the Huns to the provinces of Persia, involved them in frequent and bloody contests with the power of that monarchy. But they respected, in peace, the faith of treaties; in war, the dictates of humanity; and their memorable victory over Peroses, or Firuz, displayed the moderation, as well as the valour, of the Barbarians. The *second* division of their countrymen, the Huns, who gradually advanced towards the North-west, were exercised by the hardships of a colder climate, and a more laborious march. Necessity compelled them to exchange the silks of China for the furs of Siberia; the imperfect rudiments of civilized life were obliterated; and the native fierceness of the Huns was exasperated by their intercourse with the savage tribes, who were compared, with some propriety, to the wild beasts of the desert. Their independent spirit soon rejected the hereditary succession of the Tanjous; and while each hord was governed by its peculiar mursa, their tumultuary council directed the public measures of the whole nation. As late as the thirteenth century, their transient residence on the Eastern banks of the Volga, was attested by the name of Great Hungary.[2] In the winter, they descended with their flocks and herds towards the mouth of that mighty river; and their summer excursions reached as high as the latitude of Saratoff, or perhaps the conflux of the Kama. Such at least were the recent limits of the black Calmucks,[3] who remained about a century under the protection of Russia; and who have since returned to their native seats on the frontiers of the Chinese empire. The march, and the return, of those wandering Tartars, whose united camp consists of 50,000 tents or families, illustrate the distant emigrations of the ancient Huns.[4]

It is impossible to fill the dark interval of time which elapsed, after

the next century, the same provinces of Chorasmia and Mawaralnahr were described by Abulfeda (Hudson, Geog. Minor. iii.). Their actual misery may be seen in the Genealog. Hist. of the Tartars, p. 423.

[1] Justin (xli. 6.) has left a short abridgment of the Greek kings of Bactriana. To their industry I should ascribe the new and extraordinary trade, which transported the merchandizes of India into Europe, by the Oxus, the Caspian, the Cyrus, the Phasis, and the Euxine. The other ways, both of the land and sea, were possessed by the Seleucides and the Ptolemies. (L'Esprit des Loix, l. xxi.)

[2] In the thirteenth century, the monk Rubruquis (who traversed the immense plain of Kipzak, in his journey to the court of the Great Khan) observed the remarkable name of *Hungary*, with the traces of a common language and origin (Hist. des Voyages, vii. 269.).

[3] Bell (i. 29.), and the editors of the Genealog. Hist. (p. 539.), have described the Calmucks of the Volga in the beginning of the present century.

[4] This great transmigration of 300,000 Calmucks, or Torgouts, happened in the year 1771. The original narrative of Kien-long, the reigning emperor of China, which was intended for the inscription of a column, has been translated by the missionaries of Pekin (Mem. sur la Chine, i. 401.). The emperor affects the smooth and specious language of the Son of Heaven, and the Father of his People.

the Huns of the Volga were lost in the eyes of the Chinese, and before they showed themselves to those of the Romans. There is some reason, however, to apprehend, that the same force which had driven them from their native seats, still continued to impel their march towards the frontiers of Europe. The power of the Sienpi, their implacable enemies, which extended above 3000 miles from East to West,[1] must have gradually oppressed them by the weight and terror of a formidable neighbourhood: and the flight of the tribes of Scythia would inevitably tend to increase the strength, or to contract the territories, of the Huns. The harsh and obscure appellations of those tribes would offend the ear, without informing the understanding, of the reader; but I cannot suppress the very natural suspicion, *that* the Huns of the North derived a considerable reinforcement from the ruin of the dynasty of the South, which, in the course of the third century, submitted to the dominion of China; *that* the bravest warriors marched away in search of their free and adventurous countrymen; *and* that, as they had been divided by prosperity, they were easily re-united by the common hardships of their adverse fortune.[2] The Huns, with their flocks and herds, their wives and children, their dependents and allies, were transported to the West of the Volga: and they boldly advanced to invade the country of the Alani, a pastoral people who occupied, or wasted, an extensive tract of the deserts of Scythia. The plains beween the Volga and the Tanais were covered with the tents of the Alani, but their name and manners were diffused over the wide extent of their conquests; and the painted tribes of the Agathyrsi and Geloni were confounded among their vassals. Towards the North, they penetrated into the frozen regions of Siberia, among the savages who were accustomed, in their rage or hunger, to the taste of human flesh: and their Southern inroads were pushed as far as the confines of Persia and India. The mixture of Sarmatic and German blood had contributed to improve the features of the Alani, to whiten their swarthy complexions, and to tinge their hair with a yellowish cast, which is seldom found in the Tartar race. They were less deformed in their persons, less brutish in their manners, than the Huns; but they did not yield to those formidable Barbarians in their martial and independent spirit; in the love of freedom, which rejected even the use of domestic slaves; and in the love of arms, which considered war and rapine as the pleasure and the glory of mankind. A naked scimetar, fixed in the ground, was the only object of their religious worship; the scalps of their enemies formed the costly trappings of their horses; and they viewed, with pity and contempt, the pusillanimous warriors, who patiently expected the infirmities of age, and the tortures of lingering disease.[3] On the banks of the Tanais, the

[1] The Kang-Mou (iii. 447.) ascribes to their conquests a space of 14,000 *lis*. According to the present standard, 200 *lis* (or more accurately 193) are equal to one degree of latitude; and one English mile consequently exceeds three miles of China. But there are strong reasons to believe that the ancient *li* scarcely equalled one half of the modern. See the elaborate researches of M. d'Anville, a geographer, who is not a stranger in any age, or climate, of the globe (Mem. de l'Acad. ii. 125. Mesures Itiner. p. 154.).

[2] Hist. des Huns, ii. 125. The subsequent history (p. 145.) of three or four Hunnic dynasties evidently proves, that their martial spirit was not impaired by a long residence in China.

[3] Utque hominibus quietis et placidis otium est voluptabile, ita illos pericula juvant et bella. Judicatur ibi beatus qui in prœlio profuderit animam; senescentes etiam et fortuitis mortibus

military power of the Huns and the Alani encountered each other with equal valour, but with unequal success. The Huns prevailed in the bloody contest: the king of the Alani was slain; and the remains of the vanquished nation were dispersed by the ordinary alternative of flight or submission.[1] A colony of exiles found a secure refuge in the mountains of Caucasus, between the Euxine and the Caspian; where they still preserve their name and their independence. Another colony advanced, with more intrepid courage, towards the shores of the Baltic; associated themselves with the Northern tribes of Germany; and shared the spoil of the Roman provinces of Gaul and Spain. But the greatest part of the nation of the Alani embraced the offers of an honourable and advantageous union: and the Huns, who esteemed the valour of their less fortunate enemies, proceeded, with an increase of numbers and confidence, to invade the limits of the Gothic empire.

The great Hermanric, whose dominions extended from the Baltic to the Euxine, enjoyed, in the full maturity of age and reputation, the fruit of his victories, when (A.D. 375) he was alarmed by the formidable approach of an host of unknown enemies,[2] on whom his barbarous subjects might, without injustice, bestow the epithet of Barbarians. The numbers, the strength, the rapid motions, and the implacable cruelty of the Huns, were felt, and dreaded, and magnified, by the astonished Goths; who beheld their fields and villages consumed with flames, and deluged with indiscriminate slaughter. To these real terrors, they added the surprise and abhorrence which were excited by the shrill voice, the uncouth gestures, and the strange deformity of the Huns. These savages of Scythia were compared (and the picture had some resemblance) to the animals who walk very awkwardly on two legs; and to the mis-shapen figures, the *Termini*, which were often placed on the bridges of antiquity. They were distinguished from the rest of the human species by their broad shoulders, flat noses, and small black eyes, deeply buried in the head; and as they were almost destitute of beards, they never enjoyed either the manly graces of youth, or the venerable aspect of age.[3] A fabulous origin was assigned worthy of their form and manners; that the witches of Scythia, who, for their foul and deadly practices, had been driven from society, had copulated in the desert with infernal spirits; and that the Huns were the offspring of this execrable conjunction.[4] The tale, so full of horror and absurdity, was greedily embraced by the credulous hatred of the Goths; but, while it gratified their hatred, it increased their

mundo digressos, ut degeneres et ignavos conviciis atrocibus insectantur. We must think highly of the conquerors of *such* men.

[1] On the subject of the Alani, Ammian. (xxxi. 2.), Jornan. (de Reb. Get. c. 24.), M. de Guignes (Hist. des Huns, ii. 279.), and the Genealog. Hist. of the Tartars (ii. 617.).

[2] As we are possessed of the authentic history of the Huns, it would be impertinent to repeat, or to refute, the fables, which misrepresent their origin and progress, their passage of the mud or water of the Mæotis, in pursuit of an ox or stag, les Indes qu'ils avoient decouvertes, &c. (Zos. l. iv. 224. Soz. l. vi. c. 37. Procop. Hist. Miscell. c. 5. Jornan. c. 24. Grand. et Decad. &c. des Romains, c. 17.)

[3] Prodigiosæ formæ, et pandi; ut bipedes existimes bestias; vel quales in commarginandis pontibus, effigiati stipites dolantur incompti. Ammian. xxxi. 1. Jornandes (c. 24.) draws a strong caricature of a Calmuck face. Species pavendâ nigredine . . . . quædam deformis offa, non facies; habensque magis puncta quam lumina. Buffon, Hist. Natur. iii. 380.

[4] This execrable origin, which Jornandes (c. 24.) describes with the rancour of a Goth, might be originally derived from a more pleasing fable of the Greeks (Herodot. l. iv. c. 9, &c.).

fear; since the posterity of dæmons and witches might be supposed to inherit some share of the præternatural powers, as well as of the malignant temper, of their parents. Against these enemies, Hermanric prepared to exert the united forces of the Gothic state; but he soon discovered that his vassal tribes, provoked by oppression, were much more inclined to second, than to repel, the invasion of the Huns. One of the chiefs of the Roxolani[1] had formerly deserted the standard of Hermanric, and the cruel tyrant had condemned the innocent wife of the traitor to be torn asunder by wild horses. The brothers of that unfortunate woman seized the favourable moment of revenge. The aged king of the Goths languished some time after the dangerous wound which he received from their daggers: but the conduct of the war was retarded by his infirmities; and the public councils of the nation were distracted by a spirit of jealousy and discord. His death, which has been imputed to his own despair, left the reins of government in the hands of Withimer, who, with the doubtful aid of some Scythian mercenaries, maintained the unequal contest against the arms of the Huns and the Alani, till he was defeated and slain, in a decisive battle. The Ostrogoths submitted to their fate: and the royal race of the Amali will hereafter be found among the subjects of the haughty Attila. But the person of Witheric, the infant king, was saved by the diligence of Alatheus and Saphrax; two warriors of approved valour and fidelity; who, by cautious marches, conducted the independent remains of the nation of the Ostrogoths towards the Danastus, or Niester; a considerable river, which now separates the Turkish dominions from the empire of Russia. On the banks of the Niester, the prudent Athanaric, more attentive to his own than to the general safety, had fixed the camp of the Visigoths; with the firm resolution of opposing the victorious Barbarians, whom he thought it less advisable to provoke. The ordinary speed of the Huns was checked by the weight of baggage, and the incumbrance of captives; but their military skill deceived, and almost destroyed, the army of Athanaric. While the judge of the Visigoths defended the banks of the Niester, he was encompassed and attacked by a numerous detachment of cavalry, who, by the light of the moon, had passed the river in a fordable place; and it was not without the utmost efforts of courage and conduct, that he was able to effect his retreat towards the hilly country. The undaunted general had already formed a new and judicious plan of defensive war; and the strong lines, which he was preparing to construct betwen the mountains, the Pruth, and the Danube, would have secured the extensive and fertile territory that bears the modern name of Wallachia, from the destructive inroads of the Huns.[2] But the hopes and measures of the judge of the Visigoths were soon disappointed, by the trembling impatience of his dismayed countrymen; who were persuaded by their fears, that the interposition of the Danube was the only barrier that could save them from the rapid pursuit, and

[1] The Roxolani may be the fathers of the Ρως, the *Russians* (d'Anville, Empire de Russie, p. 1—10.), whose residence (A.D. 862.) about Novogrod Veliki cannot be very remote from that which the Geographer of Ravenna (i. 12. iv. 4. 46. v. 28. 30.) assigns to the Roxolani (A.D. 886.).

[2] The text of Ammianus seems to be imperfect, or corrupt; but the nature of the ground explains, and almost defines, the Gothic rampart. Mem. de l'Acad. xxviii. 444.

invincible valour, of the Barbarians of Scythia. Under the command of Fritigern and Alavivus,[1] the body of the nation hastily advanced to the banks of the great river, and implored the protection of the Roman emperor of the East. Athanaric himself, still anxious to avoid the guilt of perjury, retired, with a band of faithful followers, into the mountainous country of Caucaland; which appears to have been guarded, and almost concealed, by the impenetrable forests of Transylvania.[2]

After Valens had (A.D. 376) terminated the Gothic war with some appearance of glory and success, he made a progress through his dominions of Asia, and at length fixed his residence in the capital of Syria. The five years[3] which he spent at Antioch were employed to watch, from a secure distance, the hostile designs of the Persian monarch; to check the depredations of the Saracens and Isaurians;[4] to enforce, by arguments more prevalent than those of reason and eloquence, the belief of the Arian theology; and to satisfy his anxious suspicions by the promiscuous execution of the innocent and the guilty. But the attention of the emperor was most seriously engaged, by the important intelligence which he received from the civil and military officers who were entrusted with the defence of the Danube. He was informed, that the North was agitated by a furious tempest; that the irruption of the Huns, an unknown and monstrous race of savages, had subverted the power of the Goths; and that the suppliant multitudes of that warlike nation, whose pride was now humbled in the dust, covered a space of many miles along the banks of the river. With outstretched arms, and pathetic lamentations, they loudly deplored their past misfortunes and their present danger; acknowledged, that their only hope of safety was in the clemency of the Roman government; and most solemnly protested, that if the gracious liberality of the emperor would permit them to cultivate the waste lands of Thrace, they should ever hold themselves bound, by the strongest obligations of duty and gratitude, to obey the laws, and to guard the limits, of the republic. These assurances were confirmed by the ambassadors of the Goths, who impatiently expected, from the mouth of Valens, an answer that must finally determine the fate of their unhappy countrymen. The emperor of the East was no longer guided by the wisdom and authority of his elder brother, whose death happened towards the end of the preceding year (A.D. 375. Nov. 17); and as the distressful situation of the Goths required an instant and peremptory decision, he was deprived of the favourite resource of feeble and timid minds; who consider the use of dilatory and ambiguous measures as the most admirable efforts of consummate prudence. As long as the same passions and interests subsist among mankind, the questions of war

[1] M. de Buat (Hist. des Peup. de l'Europe, vi. 407.) has conceived a strange idea, that Alavivus was the same person as Ulphilas the Gothic bishop: and that Ulphilas, the grandson of a Cappadocian captive, became a temporal prince of the Goths.

[2] Ammian. (xxxi. 3.) and Jornan. (de Reb. Get. c. 24.) describe the subversion of the Gothic empire by the Huns.

[3] The chronology of Ammianus is obscure and imperfect. Tillemont has laboured to clear and settle the annals of Valens.

[4] Zos. l. iv. 223. Soz. l. vi. c. 38. The Isaurians, each winter, infested the roads of Asia Minor, as far as the neighbourhood of Constantinople. Basil, Epist. ccl. apud Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 106.

and peace, of justice and policy, which were debated in the councils of antiquity, will frequently present themselves as the subject of modern deliberation. But the most experienced statesman of Europe has never been summoned to consider the propriety, or the danger, of admitting, or rejecting, an innumerable multitude of Barbarians, who are driven by despair and hunger to solicit a settlement on the territories of a civilized nation. When that important proposition, so essentially connected with the public safety, was referred to the ministers of Valens, they were perplexed and divided; but they soon acquiesced in the flattering sentiment which seemed the most favourable to the pride, the indolence, and the avarice of their sovereign. The slaves, who were decorated with the titles of præfects and generals, dissembled or disregarded the terrors of this national emigration; so extremely different from the partial and accidental colonies, which had been received on the extreme limits of the empire. But they applauded the liberality of fortune, which had conducted, from the most distant countries of the globe, a numerous and invincible army of strangers, to defend the throne of Valens; who might now add to the royal treasures, the immense sums of gold supplied by the provincials to compensate their annual proportion of recruits. The prayers of the Goths were granted, and their service was accepted by the Imperial court: and orders were immediately dispatched to the civil and military governors of the Thracian diocese, to make the necessary preparations for the passage and subsistence of a great people, till a proper and sufficient territory could be allotted for their future residence. The liberality of the emperor was accompanied, however, with two harsh and rigorous conditions, which prudence might justify on the side of the Romans, but which distress alone could extort from the indignant Goths. Before they passed the Danube, they were required to deliver their arms: and it was insisted, that their children should be taken from them, and dispersed through the provinces of Asia; where they might be civilized by the arts of education, and serve as hostages to secure the fidelity of their parents.

During this suspense of a doubtful and distant negociation, the impatient Goths made some rash attempts to pass the Danube, without the permission of the government, whose protection they had implored. Their motions were strictly observed by the vigilance of the troops which were stationed along the river; and their foremost detachments were defeated with considerable slaughter: yet such were the timid councils of the reign of Valens, that the brave officers who had served their country in the execution of their duty, were punished by the loss of their employments, and narrowly escaped the loss of their heads. The Imperial mandate was at length received for transporting over the Danube the whole body of the Gothic nation;[1] but the execution of this order was a task of labour and difficulty. The stream of the Danube, which in those parts is above a mile broad,[2] had been swelled

[1] The passage of the Danube is exposed by Ammian. (xxxi. 3, 4.), Zos. (l. iv. 223.), Eunap Excer. Legat. p. 19.), and Jornand. (c. 25.). Ammian. declares (c. 5.), that he means only, ipsas rerum digerere *summitates*. But he often takes a false measure of their importance and his superfluous prolixity is disagreeably balanced by his unseasonable brevity.

[2] Chishull, a curious traveller, has remarked the breadth of the Danube, which he passed to

by incessant rains; and, in this tumultuous passage, many were swept away, and drowned, by the rapid violence of the current. A large fleet of vessels, of boats, and of canoes, was provided: many days and nights they passed and repassed with indefatigable toil; and the most strenuous diligence was exerted by the officers of Valens, that not a single Barbarian, of those who were reserved to subvert the foundations of Rome, should be left on the opposite shore. It was thought expedient that an accurate account should be taken of their numbers; but the persons who were employed soon desisted, with amazement and dismay, from the prosecution of the endless and impracticable task:[1] and the principal historian of the age most seriously affirms, that the prodigious armies of Darius and Xerxes, which had so long been considered as the fables of vain and credulous antiquity, were now justified, in the eyes of mankind, by the evidence of fact and experience. A probable testimony has fixed the number of the Gothic warriors at 200,000 men; and if we can venture to add the just proportion of women, of children, and of slaves, the whole mass of people which composed this formidable emigration, must have amounted to near a million of persons, of both sexes, and of all ages. The children of the Goths, those at least of a distinguished rank, were separated from the multitude. They were conducted, without delay, to the distant seats assigned for their residence and education; and as the numerous train of hostages or captives passed through the cities, their gay and splendid apparel, their robust and martial figure, excited the surprise and envy of the provincials. But the stipulation, the most offensive to the Goths, and the most important to the Romans, was shamefully eluded. The Barbarians, who considered their arms as the ensigns of honour, and the pledges of safety, were disposed to offer a price, which the lust or avarice of the Imperial officers was easily tempted to accept. To preserve their arms, the haughty warriors consented, with some reluctance, to prostitute their wives or their daughters; the charms of a beauteous maid, or a comely boy, secured the connivance of the inspectors; who sometimes cast an eye of covetousness on the fringed carpets and linen garments of their new allies,[2] or who sacrificed their duty to the mean consideration of filling their farms with cattle, and their houses with slaves. The Goths, with arms in their hands, were permitted to enter the boats; and when their strength was collected on the other side of the river, the immense camp which was spread over the plains and the hills of the Lower Mæsia, assumed a threatening and even hostile aspect. The leaders of the Ostrogoths, Alatheus and Saphrax, the guardians of their infant king, appeared soon afterwards on the Northern banks of the Danube; and immediately dispatched their ambassadors to the court of Antioch, to solicit, with the same

the south of Bucharest, near the conflux of the Argish (p. 77.). He admires the beauty and spontaneous plenty of Mæsia, or Bulgaria.

[1] Quem si scire velit, Libyci velit æquoris idem
Scire quam multæ Zephyro truduntur harenæ.

Ammianus has inserted, in his prose, these lines of Virgil (Georgic. l. ii.), originally designed by the poet to express the impossibility of numbering the different sorts of vines. Plin. Hist. Natur. l. xiv.

[2] Eunapius and Zosimus curiously specify these articles of Gothic wealth and luxury. Yet it must be presumed, that they were the manufactures of the provinces; which the Barbarians had acquired as the spoils of war; or as the gifts, or merchandise, of peace.

professions of allegiance and gratitude, the same favour which had been granted to the suppliant Visigoths. The absolute refusal of Valens suspended their progress, and discovered the repentance, the suspicions, and the fears, of the Imperial council.

An undisciplined and unsettled nation of Barbarians required the firmest temper, and the most dexterous management. The daily subsistence of near a million of extraordinary subjects could be supplied only by constant and skilful diligence, and might continually be interrupted by mistake or accident. The insolence, or the indignation, of the Goths, if they conceived themselves to be the objects either of fear, or of contempt, might urge them to the most desperate extremities; and the fortune of the state seemed to depend on the prudence, as well as the integrity, of the generals of Valens. At this important crisis, the military government of Thrace was exercised by Lupicinus and Maximus, in whose venal minds the slightest hope of private emolument outweighed every consideration of public advantage; and whose guilt was only alleviated by their incapacity of discerning the pernicious effects of their rash and criminal administration. Instead of obeying the orders of their sovereign, and satisfying, with decent liberality, the demands of the Goths, they levied an ungenerous and oppressive tax on the wants of the hungry Barbarians. The vilest food was sold at an extravagant price; and, in the room of wholesome and substantial provisions, the markets were filled with the flesh of dogs, and of unclean animals, who had died of disease. To obtain the valuable acquisition of a pound of bread, the Goths resigned the possession of an expensive, though serviceable, slave; and a small quantity of meat was greedily purchased with ten pounds of a precious, but useless, metal.[1] When their property was exhausted, they continued this necessary traffic by the sale of their sons and daughters; and notwithstanding the love of freedom, which animated every Gothic breast, they submitted to the humiliating maxim, that it was better for their children to be maintained in a servile condition, than to perish in a state of wretched and helpless independence. The most lively resentment is excited by the tyranny of pretended benefactors, who sternly exact the debt of gratitude which they have cancelled by subsequent injuries: a spirit of discontent insensibly arose in the camp of the Barbarians, who pleaded, without success, the merit of their patient and dutiful behaviour; and loudly complained of the inhospitable treatment which they had received from their new allies. They beheld around them the wealth and plenty of a fertile province, in the midst of which they suffered the intolerable hardships of artificial famine. But the means of relief, and even of revenge, were in their hands; since the rapaciousness of their tyrants had left, to an injured people, the possession and the use of arms. The clamours of a multitude, untaught to disguise their sentiments, announced the first symptoms of resistance, and alarmed the timid and guilty minds of Lupicinus and Maximus. Those crafty ministers, who substituted the

[1] *Decem libras;* the word *silver* must be understood. Jornandes betrays the passions and prejudices of a Goth. The servile Greeks, Eunapius and Zosimus, disguise the Roman oppression, and execrate the perfidy of the Barbarians. Ammianus, a patriot historian, slightly, and reluctantly, touches on the odious subject. Jerom, who wrote almost on the spot, is fair, though concise. Per avaritiam Maximi ducis, ad rebellionem fame *coacti* sunt (in Chron.).

cunning of temporary expedients to the wise and salutary counsels of general policy, attempted to remove the Goths from their dangerous station on the frontiers of the empire; and to disperse them in separate quarters of cantonment, through the interior provinces. As they were conscious how ill they had deserved the respect, or confidence, of the Barbarians, they diligently collected, from every side, a military force, that might urge the tardy and reluctant march of a people, who had not yet renounced the title, or the duties, of Roman subjects. But the generals of Valens, while their attention was solely directed to the discontented Visigoths, imprudently disarmed the ships and the fortifications which constituted the defence of the Danube. The fatal oversight was observed, and improved, by Alatheus and Saphrax, who anxiously watched the favourable moment of escaping from the pursuit of the Huns. By the help of such rafts and vessels as could be hastily procured, the leaders of the Ostrogoths transported, without opposition, their king and their army; and boldly fixed an hostile and independent camp on the territories of the empire.—*Ammian.* xxxi. 4, 5.

Under the name of judges, Alavivus and Fritigern were the leaders of the Visigoths in peace and war; and the authority which they derived from their birth, was ratified by the free consent of the nation. In a season of tranquillity, their power might have been equal, as well as their rank; but, as soon as their countrymen were exasperated by hunger and oppression, the superior abilities of Fritigern assumed the military command, which he was qualified to exercise for the public welfare. He restrained the impatient spirit of the Visigoths, till the injuries and the insults of their tyrants should justify their resistance in the opinion of mankind: but he was not disposed to sacrifice any solid advantages for the empty praise of justice and moderation. Sensible of the benefits which would result from the union of the Gothic powers under the same standard, he secretly cultivated the friendship of the Ostrogoths; and while he professed an implicit obedience to the orders of the Roman generals, he proceeded by slow marches towards Marcianopolis, the capital of the Lower Mæsia, about 70 miles from the banks of the Danube. On that fatal spot, the flames of discord and mutual hatred burst forth into a dreadful conflagration. Lupicinus had invited the Gothic chiefs to a splendid entertainment; and their martial train remained under arms at the entrance of the palace. But the gates of the city were strictly guarded; and the Barbarians were sternly excluded from the use of a plentiful market, to which they asserted their equal claim of subjects and allies. Their humble prayers were rejected with insolence and derision; and as their patience was now exhausted, the townsmen, the soldiers, and the Goths, were soon involved in a conflict of passionate altercation and angry reproaches. A blow was imprudently given; a sword was hastily drawn; and the first blood that was spilt in this accidental quarrel, became the signal of a long and destructive war. In the midst of noise and brutal intemperance, Lupicinus was informed, by a secret messenger, that many of his soldiers were slain, and despoiled of their arms; and as he was already inflamed by wine, and oppressed by sleep, he issued a rash command, that their death should be revenged by the massacre of the guards of Fritigern and Alavivus. The clamorous

shouts and dying groans apprised Fritigern of his extreme danger: and, as he possessed the calm and intrepid spirit of a hero, he saw that he was lost if he allowed a moment of deliberation to the man who had so deeply injured him. "A trifling dispute," said the Gothic leader, with a firm but gentle tone of voice, "appears to have arisen between "the two nations; but it may be productive of the most dangerous "consequences, unless the tumult is immediately pacified by the as-"surance of our safety, and the authority of our presence." At these words, Fritigern and his companions drew their swords, opened their passage through the unresisting crowd, which filled the palace, the streets, and the gates, of Marcianopolis, and, mounting their horses, hastily vanished from the eyes of the astonished Romans. The generals of the Goths were saluted by the fierce and joyful acclamations of the camp: war was instantly resolved, and the resolution was executed without delay: the banners of the nation were displayed according to the custom of their ancestors; and the air resounded with the harsh and mournful music of the Barbarian trumpet.[1] The weak and guilty Lupicinus, who had dared to provoke, who had neglected to destroy, and who still presumed to despise, his formidable enemy, marched against the Goths, at the head of such a military force as could be collected on this sudden emergency. The Barbarians expected his approach about nine miles from Marcianopolis; and on this occasion the talents of the general were found to be of more prevailing efficacy than the weapons and discipline of the troops. The valour of the Goths were so ably directed by the genius of Fritigern, that they broke, by a close and vigorous attack, the ranks of the Roman legions. Lupicinus left his arms and standards, his tribunes and his bravest soldiers, on the field of battle; and their useless courage served only to protect the ignominious flight of their leader. "That successful "day put an end to the distress of the Barbarians, and the security of "the Romans: from that day, the Goths, renouncing the precarious "condition of strangers and exiles, assumed the character of citizens "and masters, claimed an absolute dominion over the possessors of "land, and held, in their own right, the northern provinces of the em-"pire, which are bounded by the Danube." Such are the words of the Gothic historian,[2] who celebrates, with rude eloquence, the glory of his countrymen. But the dominion of the Barbarians was exercised only for the purposes of rapine and destruction. As they had been deprived, by the ministers of the emperor, of the common benefits of nature, and the fair intercourse of social life, they retaliated the injustice on the subjects of the empire; and the crimes of Lupicinus were expiated by the ruin of the peaceful husbandmen of Thrace, the conflagration

[1] Vexillis de *more* sublatis, auditisque *triste sonantibus classicis.* Ammian. xxxi. 5. These are the *rauca cornua* of Claudian (in Rufin. ii. 57.), the large horns of the *Uri,* or wild bull; such as have been more recently used by the Swiss Cantons of Uri and Underwald (Simler de Repub. Helvet. l. ii. 201. ed. Fuselin. Tigur. 1734.). Their military horn is finely, though perhaps casually, introduced in an original narrative of the battle of Nancy (A.D. 1477.) "Attendant le combat le dit cor fut corné par trois fois, tant que le vent du soufleur "pouvoit durer: ce qui esbahit fort Monsieur de Bourgoigne; *car deja à Morat l'avoit "ouy.*" (Pieces Justificatives in 4to ed. of Philippe de Comines, iii. 493.)

[2] Jornan. de Reb. Get. c. 26. p. 648. ed. Grot. These *splendidi panni* (they are comparatively such) are undoubtedly transcribed from the larger histories of Priscus, Ablavius, or Cassiodorus.

of their villages, and the massacre, or captivity, of their innocent families. The report of the Gothic victory was soon diffused over the adjacent country; and while it filled the minds of the Romans with terror and dismay, their own hasty imprudence contributed to increase the forces of Fritigern, and the calamities of the province. Some time before the great emigration, a numerous body of Goths, under the command of Suerid and Colias, had been received into the protection and service of the empire.[1] They were encamped under the walls of Hadrianople: but the ministers of Valens were anxious to remove them beyond the Hellespont, at a distance from the dangerous temptation which might so easily be communicated by the neighbourhood, and the success, of their countrymen. The respectful submission with which they yielded to the order of their march, might be considered as a proof of their fidelity; and their moderate request of a sufficient allowance of provisions, and of a delay of only two days, was expressed in the most dutiful terms. But the first magistrate of Hadrianople, incensed by some disorders which had been committed at his country-house, refused his indulgence; and arming against them the inhabitants and manufacturers of a populous city, he urged, with hostile threats, their instant departure. The Barbarians stood silent and amazed, till they were exasperated by the insulting clamours and missile weapons of the populace: but when patience or contempt was fatigued, they crushed the undisciplined multitude, inflicted many a shameful wound on the backs of their flying enemies, and despoiled them of the splendid armour,[2] which they were unworthy to bear. The resemblance of their sufferings and their actions soon united this victorious detachment to the nation of the Visigoths; the troops of Colias and Suerid expected the approach of the great Fritigern, ranged themselves under his standard, and signalized their ardour in the siege of Hadrianople. But the resistance of the garrison informed the Barbarians, that, in the attack of regular fortifications, the efforts of unskilful courage are seldom effectual. Their general acknowledged his error, raised the siege, declared that "he was at peace with stone "walls,"[3] and revenged his disappointment on the adjacent country. He accepted, with pleasure, the useful reinforcement of hardy workmen, who laboured in the gold mines of Thrace,[4] for the emolument, and under the lash, of an unfeeling master:[5] and these new associates conducted the Barbarians, through the secret paths, to the most sequestered places, which had been chosen to secure the inhabitants, the cattle, and the magazines of corn. With the assistance of such

[1] Cum populis suis longe ante suscepti. We are ignorant of the precise date and circumstances of their transmigration.

[2] An Imperial manufacture of shields, &c. was established at Hadrianople; and the populace were headed by the *Fabricenses*, or workmen (Vales. ad Ammian. xxxi. 6.).

[3] Pacem sibi esse cum parietibus memorans. Ammian. xxxi. 7.

[4] These mines were in the country of the Bessi, in the ridge of mountains, the Rhodope, that runs between Philippi and Philippopolis, two Macedonian cities, which derived their name and origin from the father of Alexander. From the mines of Thrace he annually received the value, not the weight, of a thousand talents (£200,000): a revenue which paid the phalanx, and corrupted the orators of Greece. Diodor. Siculus, ii. l. xvi. 88. ed. Wesseling. Godefroy on the Theod. Code. iii. 496. Cellarius, Geog. Antiq. i. 676. 857. D'Anville, Geog. Anc. i. 336.

[5] As those unhappy workmen often ran away, Valens had enacted severe laws to drag them from their hiding-places. Cod. Theod. l. x. tit. xix. leg. 5. 7.

guides, nothing could remain impervious, or inaccessible; resistance was fatal; flight was impracticable; and the patient submission of helpless innocence seldom found mercy from the Barbarian conqueror. In the course of these depredations, a great number of the children of the Goths, who had been sold into captivity, were restored to the embraces of their afflicted parents; but these tender interviews, which might have revived and cherished in their minds some sentiments of humanity, tended only to stimulate their native fierceness by the desire of revenge. They listened, with eager attention, to the complaints of their captive children, who had suffered the most cruel indignities from the lustful or angry passions of their masters; and the same cruelties, the same indignities, were severely retaliated on the sons and daughters of the Romans.[1]

The imprudence of Valens and his ministers had introduced into the heart of the empire a nation of enemies; but the Visigoths might even yet have been reconciled, by the manly confession of past errors, and the sincere performance of former engagements. These healing and temperate measures seemed to concur with the timorous disposition of the sovereign of the East: but, on this occasion alone, Valens was brave; and his unseasonable bravery was fatal to himself and to his subjects. He declared (A.D. 377) his intention of marching from Antioch to Constantinople, to subdue this dangerous rebellion; and, as he was not ignorant of the difficulties of the enterprise, he solicited the assistance of his nephew, the emperor Gratian, who commanded all the forces of the West. The veteran troops were hastily recalled from the defence of Armenia; that important frontier was abandoned to the discretion of Sapor; and the immediate conduct of the Gothic war was entrusted, during the absence of Valens, to his lieutenants Trajan and Profuturus, two generals who indulged themselves in a very false and favourable opinion of their own abilities. On their arrival in Thrace, they were joined by Richomer, count of the domestics; and the auxiliaries of the West, that marched under his banner, were composed of the Gallic legions, reduced indeed by a spirit of desertion to the vain appearances of strength and numbers. In a council of war, which was influenced by pride, rather than by reason, it was resolved to seek, and to encounter, the Barbarians; who lay encamped in the spacious and fertile meadows, near the most southern of the six mouths of the Danube.[2] Their camp was surrounded by the usual fortification of waggons;[3] and the Barbarians, secure within the vast circle of the inclosure, enjoyed the fruits of their valour, and the spoils of the province. In the midst of riotous intemperance, the watchful Fritigern observed the motions, and penetrated the designs, of the Romans. He perceived, that the numbers of the enemy were continually increasing; and, as he understood their intention of attack-

[1] Ammian. xxxi. 5, 6. The historian of the Gothic war loses time and space, by an unseasonable recapitulation of the ancient inroads of the Barbarians.

[2] The Itinerary of Antoninus (p. 226, ed. Wesseling) marks the situation of this place about 60 miles north of Tomi, Ovid's exile: and the name of *Salices* (the willows) expresses the nature of the soil.

[3] This circle of waggons, the *Carrago*, was the usual fortification of the Barbarians (Vegetius de Re Militari, l. iii. c. 10. Valesius ad Ammian. xxxi. 7.). The practice and the name were preserved by their descendants, as late as the fifteenth century. The *Charroy*, which surrounded the *Ost*, is a word familiar to the readers of Froissart, or Comines.

ing his rear, as soon as the scarcity of forage should oblige him to remove his camp; he recalled to their standard his predatory detachments, which covered the adjacent country. As soon as they descried the flaming beacons,[1] they obeyed, with incredible speed, the signal of their leader; the camp was filled with the martial crowd of Barbarians; their impatient clamours demanded the battle, and their tumultuous zeal was approved and animated by the spirit of their chiefs. The evening was already far advanced; and the two armies prepared themselves for the approaching combat, which was deferred only till the dawn of day. While the trumpets sounded to arms, the undaunted courage of the Goths was confirmed by the mutual obligation of a solemn oath; and as they advanced to meet the enemy, the rude songs, which celebrated the glory of their forefathers, were mingled with their fierce and dissonant outcries; and opposed to the artificial harmony of the Roman shout. Some military skill was displayed by Fritigern to gain the advantage of a commanding eminence; but the bloody conflict, which began and ended with the light, was maintained, on either side, by the personal and obstinate efforts of strength, valour, and agility. The legions of Armenia supported their fame in arms; but they were oppressed by the irresistible weight of the hostile multitude: the left wing of the Romans was thrown into disorder, and the field was strewed with their mangled carcases. This partial defeat was balanced, however, by partial success; and when the two armies, at a late hour of the evening, retreated to their respective camps, neither of them could claim the honours, or the effects, of a decisive victory. The real loss was more severely felt by the Romans, in proportion to the smallness of their numbers; but the Goths were so deeply confounded and dismayed by this vigorous, and perhaps unexpected, resistance, that they remained seven days within the circle of their fortifications. Such funeral rites, as the circumstances of time and place would admit, were piously discharged to some officers of distinguished rank; but the indiscriminate vulgar was left unburied on the plain. Their flesh was greedily devoured by the birds of prey, who, in that age, enjoyed very frequent and delicious feasts; and several years afterwards the white and naked bones, which covered the wide extent of the fields, presented to the eyes of Ammianus a dreadful monument of the battle of Salices.[2]

The progress of the Goths had been checked by the doubtful event of that bloody day; and the Imperial generals, whose army would have been consumed by the repetition of such a contest, embraced the more rational plan, of destroying the Barbarians, by the wants and pressure of their own multitudes. They prepared to confine the Visigoths in the narrow angle of land, between the Danube, the desert of Scythia, and the mountains of Hæmus, till their strength and spirit should be insensibly wasted by the inevitable operation of

[1] Statim ut accensi malleoli. I have used the literal sense of real torches or beacons: but I almost suspect, that it is only one of those turgid metaphors, those false ornaments, that perpetually disfigure the style of Ammianus.

[2] Indicant nunc usque albentes ossibus campi. Ammian. xxxi. 7. The historian might have viewed those plains, either as a soldier, or as a traveller. But his modesty has suppressed the adventures of his own life subsequent to the Persian wars of Constantius and Julian. We are ignorant of the time when he quitted the service and retired to Rome, where he appears to have composed his History of his Own Times.

famine. The design was prosecuted with some conduct and success; the Barbarians had almost exhausted their own magazines, and the harvests of the country; and the diligence of Saturninus, the master-general of the cavalry, was employed to improve the strength, and to contract the extent, of the Roman fortifications. His labours were interrupted by the alarming intelligence, that new swarms of Barbarians had passed the unguarded Danube, either to support the cause, or to imitate the example, of Fritigern. The just apprehension, that he himself might be surrounded, and overwhelmed, by the arms of hostile and unknown nations, compelled Saturninus to relinquish the siege of the Gothic camp: and the indignant Visigoths, breaking from their confinement, satiated their hunger and revenge, by the repeated devastation of the fruitful country, which extends above 300 miles from the banks of the Danube to the straits of the Hellespont.—*Ammian.* xxxi. 8. The sagacious Fritigern had successfully appealed to the passions, as well as to the interest, of his Barbarian allies; and the love of rapine, and the hatred of Rome, seconded, or even prevented, the eloquence of his ambassadors. He cemented a strict and useful alliance with the great body of his countrymen, who obeyed Alatheus and Saphrax as the guardians of their infant king: the long animosity of rival tribes was suspended by the sense of their common interest; the independent part of the nation was associated under one standard; and the chiefs of the Ostrogoths appear to have yielded to the superior genius of the general of the Visigoths. He obtained the formidable aid of the Taifalæ, whose military renown was disgraced and polluted by the public infamy of their domestic manners. But the most powerful auxiliaries of the Goths were drawn from the camp of those enemies who had expelled them from their native seats. The loose subordination, and extensive possessions, of the Huns and the Alani, delayed the conquests, and distracted the councils, of that victorious people. Several of the Hords were allured by the liberal promises of Fritigern; and the rapid cavalry of Scythia, added weight and energy to the steady and strenuous efforts of the Gothic infantry. The Sarmatians, who could never forgive the successor of Valentinian, enjoyed and increased the general confusion; and a seasonable irruption of the Alemanni, into the provinces of Gaul, engaged the attention, and diverted the forces, of the emperor of the West.[1]

One of the most dangerous inconveniences of the introduction of the Barbarians into the army and the palaces, was sensibly felt in their correspondence with their hostile countrymen; to whom they imprudently, or maliciously, revealed the weakness of the Roman empire. A soldier, of the life-guards of Gratian, was of the nation of the Alemanni, and of the tribe of the Lentienses, who dwelt beyond the lake of Constance. Some domestic business obliged him to request a leave of absence. In a short visit to his family and friends, he was exposed to their curious inquiries; and the vanity of the loquacious soldier tempted him to display his intimate acquaintance with the secrets of the state, and the designs of his master. The intelligence,

[1] Ammian. xxxi. 8, 9. Jerom (tom. i. 26.) enumerates the nations, and marks a calamitous period of twenty years. This epistle to Heliodorus was composed in the year 397 (Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xii. 645.).

that Gratian was preparing to lead the military force of Gaul, and of the West, to the assistance of his uncle Valens, pointed out to the restless spirit of the Alemanni, the moment, and the mode, of a successful invasion. The enterprise of some light detachments, who, in the month of February, passed the Rhine upon the ice, was the prelude of a more important war. The boldest hopes of rapine, perhaps of conquest, outweighed the considerations of timid prudence, or national faith. Every forest, and every village, poured forth a band of hardy adventurers; and the great army of the Alemanni, which, on their approach, was estimated at 40,000 men by the fears of the people, was afterwards magnified to the number of 70,000, by the vain and credulous flattery of the Imperial court. The legions, which had been ordered to march into Pannonia, were immediately recalled, or detained, for the defence of Gaul; the military command was divided between Nanienus and Mellobaudes; and the youthful emperor, though he respected the long experience and sober wisdom of the former, was much more inclined to admire, and to follow, the martial ardour of his colleague; who was allowed to unite the incompatible characters of count of the domestics, and of king of the Franks. His rival Priarius, king of the Alemanni, was guided, or rather impelled, by the same headstrong valour; and as their troops were animated by the spirit of their leaders, they met, they saw, they encountered, each other, near the town of Argentaria, or Colmar,[1] in the plains of Alsace (A.D. 378. May). The glory of the day was justly ascribed to the missile weapons, and well-practised evolutions, of the Roman soldiers: the Alemanni, who long maintained their ground, were slaughtered with unrelenting fury: 5000 only of the Barbarians escaped to the woods and mountains; and the glorious death of their king on the field of battle, saved him from the reproaches of the people, who are always disposed to accuse the justice, or policy, of an unsuccessful war. After this signal victory, which secured the peace of Gaul, and asserted the honour of the Roman arms, the emperor Gratian appeared to proceed without delay on his Eastern expedition; but as he approached the confines of the Alemanni, he suddenly inclined to the left, surprised them by his unexpected passage of the Rhine, and boldly advanced into the heart of their country. The Barbarians opposed to his progress the obstacles of nature and of courage; and still continued to retreat, from one hill to another, till they were satisfied, by repeated trials, of the power and perseverance of their enemies. Their submission was accepted, as a proof, not indeed of their sincere repentance, but of their actual distress; and a select number of their brave and robust youth was exacted from the faithless nation, as the most substantial pledge of their future moderation. The subjects of the empire, who had so often experienced that the Alemanni could neither be subdued by arms, nor restrained by treaties, might not promise themselves any solid or lasting tranquillity: but they discovered, in the virtues of their young sovereign, the prospect of a long and auspicious reign. When the legions climbed the mountains, and

[1] The field of battle, *Argentaria*, or *Argentovaria*, is accurately fixed by M. d'Anville (Not. de l'Ancien. Gaul, 96.) at 23 Gallic leagues, or thirty-four and a half Roman miles, to the south of Strasburgh. From its ruins the adjacent town of *Colmar* has arisen.

scaled the fortifications, of the Barbarians, the valour of Gratian was distinguished in the foremost ranks; and the gilt and variegated armour of his guards was pierced and shattered by the blows, which they had received in their constant attachment to the person of their sovereign. At the age of nineteen, the son of Valentinian seemed to possess the talents of peace and war; and his personal success against the Alemanni was interpreted as a sure presage of his Gothic triumphs.[1]

While Gratian deserved and enjoyed the applause of his subjects, the emperor Valens, who, at length, had removed his court and army from Antioch, was received by the people of Constantinople as the author of the public calamity. Before he had reposed himself ten days (A.D. 378. May 30—June 11.) in the capital, he was urged, by the licentious clamours of the Hippodrome, to march against the Barbarians, whom he had invited into his dominions: and the citizens, who are always brave at a distance from any real danger, declared, with confidence, that, if they were supplied with arms, *they* alone would undertake to deliver the province from the ravages of an insulting foe.[2] The vain reproaches of an ignorant multitude hastened the downfall of the Roman empire; they provoked the desperate rashness of Valens; who did not find, either in his reputation, or in his mind, any motives to support with firmness the public contempt. He was soon persuaded, by the successful achievements of his lieutenants, to despise the power of the Goths, who, by the diligence of Fritigern, were now collected in the neighbourhood of Hadrianople. The march of the Taifalæ had been intercepted by the valiant Frigerid; the king of those licentious Barbarians was slain in battle; and the suppliant captives were sent into distant exile to cultivate the lands of Italy, which were assigned for their settlement, in the vacant territories of Modena and Parma.[3] The exploits of Sebastian,[4] who was recently engaged in the service of Valens, and promoted to the rank of master-general of the infantry, were still more honourable to himself, and useful to the republic. He obtained the permission of selecting 300 soldiers from each of the legions; and this separate detachment soon acquired the spirit of discipline, and the exercise of arms, which were almost forgotten under the reign of Valens. By the vigour and conduct of Sebastian, a large body of the Goths was surprised in their camp: and the immense spoil which was recovered from their hands, filled the city of Hadrianople, and the adjacent plain. The splendid

[1] The full and impartial narrative of Ammian. (xxxi. 10.) may derive some additional light from the Epitome of Victor, the Chronicle of Jerom, and the History of Orosius (l. vii. c. 33. p. 552. ed. Havercamp).

[2] Moratus paucissimos dies, seditione popularium levium pulsus. Ammian. xxxi. 11. Socrates (l. iv. c. 38.) supplies the dates and some circumstances.

[3] Vivosque omnes circa Mutinam, Regiumque, et Parmam, Italica oppida, ruro culturos exterminavit. Ammian. xxxi. 9. Those cities and districts, about ten years after the colony of the Taifalæ, appear in a very desolate state. Muratori, Dissert. sopra le Antich. Ital. i. Dissertat. xxi. 354.

[4] Ammian. xxxi. 11. Zos. l. iv. 228. The latter expatiates on the desultory exploits of Sebastian, and dispatches, in a few lines, the important battle of Hadrianople. According to the ecclesiastical critics, who hate Sebastian, the praise of Zosimus is disgrace (Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 121.). His prejudice and ignorance undoubtedly render him a very questionable judge of merit.

narratives, which the general transmitted of his own exploits, alarmed the Imperial court by the appearance of superior merit; and though he cautiously insisted on the difficulties of the Gothic war, his valour was praised, his advice was rejected; and Valens, who listened with pride and pleasure to the flattering suggestions of the eunuchs of the palace, was impatient to seize the glory of an easy and assured conquest. His army was strengthened by a numerous reinforcement of veterans; and his march from Constantinople to Hadrianople was conducted with so much military skill, that he prevented the activity of the Barbarians, who designed to occupy the intermediate defiles, and to intercept either the troops themselves, or their convoys of provisions. The camp of Valens, which he pitched under the walls of Hadrianople, was fortified, according to the practice of the Romans, with a ditch and rampart; and a most important council was summoned, to decide the fate of the emperor and of the empire. The party of reason and of delay was strenuously maintained by Victor, who had corrected, by the lessons of experience, the native fierceness of the Sarmatian character; while Sebastian, with the flexible and obsequious eloquence of a courtier, represented every precaution, and every measure, that implied a doubt of immediate victory, as unworthy of the courage and majesty of their invincible monarch. The ruin of Valens was precipitated by the deceitful arts of Fritigern, and the prudent admonitions of the emperor of the West. The advantages of negociating in the midst of war were perfectly understood by the general of the Barbarians; and a Christian ecclesiastic was dispatched, as the holy minister of peace, to penetrate, and to perplex, the councils of the enemy. The misfortunes, as well as the provocations, of the Gothic nation, were forcibly and truly described by their ambassador; who protested, in the name of Fritigern, that he was still disposed to lay down his arms, or to employ them only in the defence of the empire; if he could secure, for his wandering countrymen, a tranquil settlement on the waste lands of Thrace, and a sufficient allowance of corn and cattle. But he added, in a whisper of confidential friendship, that the exasperated Barbarians were averse to these reasonable conditions; and that Fritigern was doubtful whether he could accomplish the conclusion of the treaty, unless he found himself supported by the presence, and terrors, of an Imperial army. About the same time, Count Richomer returned from the West, to announce the defeat and submission of the Alemanni, to inform Valens that his nephew advanced by rapid marches at the head of the veteran and victorious legions of Gaul; and to request, in the name of Gratian and of the republic, that every dangerous and decisive measure might be suspended, till the junction of the two emperors should ensure the success of the Gothic war. But the feeble sovereign of the East was actuated only by the fatal illusions of pride and jealousy. He disdained the importunate advice; he rejected the humiliating aid; he secretly compared the ignominious, at least the inglorious, period of his own reign, with the fame of a beardless youth; and Valens rushed into the field, to erect his imaginary trophy, before the diligence of his colleague could usurp any share of the triumphs of the day.

On the ninth of August (A.D. 378), a day which has deserved to be marked among the most inauspicious of the Roman Calendar,[1] the emperor Valens, leaving, under a strong guard, his baggage and military treasure, marched from Hadrianople to attack the Goths, who were encamped about twelve miles from the city.[2] By some mistake of the orders, or some ignorance of the ground, the right wing, or column of cavalry, arrived in sight of the enemy, whilst the left was still at a considerable distance; the soldiers were compelled, in the sultry heat of summer, to precipitate their pace; and the line of battle was formed with tedious confusion, and irregular delay. The Gothic cavalry had been detached to forage in the adjacent country; and Fritigern still continued to practise his customary arts. He dispatched messengers of peace, made proposals, required hostages, and wasted the hours, till the Romans, exposed without shelter to the burning rays of the sun, were exhausted by thirst, hunger, and intolerable fatigue. The emperor was persuaded to send an ambassador to the Gothic camp; the zeal of Richomer, who alone had courage to accept the dangerous commission, was applauded: and the count of the domestics, adorned with the splendid ensigns of his dignity, had proceeded some way in the space between the two armies, when he was suddenly recalled by the alarm of battle. The hasty and imprudent attack was made by Bacurius the Iberian, who commanded a body of archers and targetteers; and as they advanced with rashness, they retreated with loss and disgrace. In the same moment, the flying squadrons of Alatheus and Saphrax, whose return was anxiously expected by the general of the Goths, descended like a whirlwind from the hills, swept across the plain, and added new terrors to the tumultuous, but irresistible, charge of the Barbarian host. The event of the battle of Hadrianople, so fatal to Valens and to the empire, may be described in a few words: the Roman cavalry fled; the infantry was abandoned, surrounded, and cut in pieces. The most skilful evolutions, the firmest courage, are scarcely sufficient to extricate a body of foot, encompassed, on an open plain, by superior numbers of horse: but the troops of Valens, oppressed by the weight of the enemy and their own fears, were crowded into a narrow space, where it was impossible for them to extend their ranks, or even to use, with effect, their swords and javelins. In the midst of tumult, of slaughter, and of dismay, the emperor, deserted by his guards, and wounded, as it was supposed, with an arrow, sought protection among the Lancearii and the Mattiarii, who still maintained their ground with some appearance of order and firmness. His faithful generals, Trajan and Victor, who perceived his danger, loudly exclaimed, that all was lost, unless the person of the emperor could be saved. Some troops, animated by their exhortation, advanced to his relief: they found only a bloody spot, covered with a heap of broken arms and mangled bodies, without being able to dis-

[1] Ammian. (xxxi. 12, 13.) almost alone describes the councils and actions which were terminated by the fatal battle of Hadrianople. We might censure the vices of his style, the disorder and perplexity of his narrative: but we must now take leave of this impartial historian; and reproach is silenced by our regret for such an irreparable loss.

[2] The difference of the 8 miles of Ammianus, and the 12 of Idatius, can only embarrass those critics (Vilesius ad loc.), who suppose a great army to be a mathematical point, without space or dimensions.

cover their unfortunate prince, either among the living or the dead. Their search could not indeed be successful, if there is any truth in the circumstances with which some historians have related the death of the emperor. By the care of his attendants, Valens was removed from the field of battle to a neighbouring cottage, where they attempted to dress his wound, and to provide for his future safety. But this humble retreat was instantly surrounded by the enemy: they tried to force the door; they were provoked by a discharge of arrows from the roof; till at length, impatient of delay, they set fire to a pile of dry faggots, and consumed the cottage, with the Roman emperor and his train. Valens perished in the flames; and a youth who dropt from the window, alone escaped, to attest the melancholy tale, and to inform the Goths of the inestimable prize which they had lost by their own rashness. A great number of brave and distinguished officers perished in the battle of Hadrianople, which equalled, in the actual loss, and far surpassed, in the fatal consequences, the misfortune which Rome had formerly sustained in the fields of Cannæ.[1] Two master-generals of the cavalry and infantry, two great officers of the palace, and thirty-five tribunes, were found among the slain; and the death of Sebastian might satisfy the world, that he was the victim, as well as the author, of the public calamity. Above two-thirds of the Roman army were destroyed: and the darkness of the night was esteemed a very favourable circumstance; as it served to conceal the flight of the multitude, and to protect the more orderly retreat of Victor and Richomer, who alone, amidst the general consternation, maintained the advantage of calm courage and regular discipline.[2]

While the impressions of grief and terror were still recent in the minds of men, the most celebrated rhetorician of the age composed the funeral oration of a vanquished army, and of an unpopular prince, whose throne was already occupied by a stranger. "There are not wanting," says the candid Libanius, "those who arraign the prudence "of the emperor, or who impute the public misfortune to the want of "courage and discipline in the troops. For my own part, I reverence "the memory of their former exploits: I reverence the glorious death, "which they bravely received, standing, and fighting in their ranks: I "reverence the field of battle, stained with *their* blood, and the blood "of the Barbarians. Those honourable marks have been already "washed away by the rains; but the lofty monuments of their bones, "the bones of generals, of centurions, and of valiant wariors, claim a "longer period of duration. The king himself fought and fell in the "foremost ranks of the battle. His attendants presented him with the "fleetest horses of the Imperial stable, that would soon have carried "him beyond the pursuit of the enemy. They vainly pressed him to

[1] Nec ullâ, annalibus, præter Cannensem pugnam ita ad internecionem res legitur gesta. Ammian. xxxi. 13. According to the grave Polybius, no more than 370 horse, and 3000 foot, escaped from the field of Cannæ: 10,000 were made prisoners; and the number of the slain amounted to 5630 horse, and 70,000 foot (Polyb. l. iii. 371. ed. Casaubon, 8vo.). Livy (xxii. 49.) is somewhat less bloody: he slaughters only 2700 horse, and 40,000 foot. The Roman army was supposed to consist of 87,200 effective men (xxii. 36.).

[2] We have gained some faint light from Jerom (i. 26. and in Chron. p. 188.), Victor (in Epit.), Oros. (l. vii. c. 33. 554.), Jornand. (c. 27.), Zos. (l. iv. 230.), Socr. (l. iv. c. 38.), Soz. (l. vi. c. 40.), Idatius (in Chron.). But their united evidence, if weighed against Ammianus alone, is light and unsubstantial.

"reserve his important life for the future service of the republic. He "still declared, that he was unworthy to survive so many of the bravest "and most faithful of his subjects; and the monarch was nobly buried "under a mountain of the slain. Let none, therefore, presume to "ascribe the victory of the Barbarians to the fear, the weakness, or the "imprudence of the Roman troops. The chiefs and the soldiers were "animated by the virtue of their ancestors, whom they equalled in dis-"cipline, and the arts of war. Their generous emulation was supported "by the love of glory, which prompted them to contend at the same "time with heat and thirst, with fire and the sword; and cheerfully to "embrace an honourable death, as their refuge against flight and in-"famy. The indignation of the gods has been the only cause of the "success of our enemies." The truth of history may disclaim some parts of this panegyric, which cannot strictly be reconciled with the character of Valens, or the circumstances of the battle: but the fairest commendation is due to the eloquence, and still more to the generosity, of the sophist of Antioch.[1]

The pride of the Goths was elated by this memorable victory; but their avarice was disappointed by the mortifying discovery, that the richest part of the Imperial spoil had been within the walls of Hadrianople. They hastened to possess the reward of their valour; but they were encountered by the remains of a vanquished army, with an intrepid resolution, which was the effect of their despair, and the only hope of their safety. The walls of the city, and the ramparts of the adjacent camp, were lined with military engines, that threw stones of an enormous weight; and astonished the ignorant Barbarians by the noise and velocity, still more than by the real effects, of the discharge. The soldiers, the citizens, the provincials, the domestics of the palace, were united in the danger, and in the defence: the furious assault of the Goths was repulsed; their secret arts of treachery and treason were discovered; and, after an obstinate conflict of many hours, they retired to their tents; convinced, by experience, that it would be far more advisable to observe the treaty, which their sagacious leader had tacitly stipulated with the fortifications of great and populous cities. After the hasty and impolitic massacre of three hundred deserters, an act of justice extremely useful to the discipline of the Roman armies, the Goths indignantly raised the siege of Hadrianople. The scene of war and tumult was instantly converted into a silent solitude: the multitude suddenly disappeared; the secret paths of the woods and mountains were marked with the footsteps of the trembling fugitives, who sought a refuge in the distant cities of Illyricum and Macedonia: and the faithful officers of the household, and the treasury, cautiously proceeded in search of the emperor, of whose death they were still ignorant. The tide of the Gothic inundation rolled from the walls of Hadrianople to the suburbs of Constantinople. The Barbarians were surprised with the splendid appearance of the capital of the East, the height and extent of the walls, the myriads of wealthy and affrighted citizens who crowded the ramparts, and the various prospect of the sea and land. While they gazed with hopeless desire on the inaccessible beauties of Constantinople, a sally was made from one of the gates by

[1] Liban. de ulciscend. Julian. Nece, c. 3. in Fabric. Biblio. Græc. tom. vii. 145.

a party of Saracens,[1] who had been fortunately engaged in the service of Valens. The cavalry of Scythia was forced to yield to the admirable swiftness and spirit of the Arabian horses; their riders were skilled in the evolutions of irregular war; and the Northern Barbarians were astonished, and dismayed, by the inhuman ferocity of the Barbarians of the South. A Gothic soldier was slain by the dagger of an Arab; and the hairy, naked savage, applying his lips to the wound, expressed a horrid delight, while he sucked the blood of his vanquished enemy.[2] The army of the Goths, laden with the spoils of the wealthy suburbs, and the adjacent territory, slowly moved, from the Bosphorus, to the mountains which form the western boundary of Thrace. The important pass of Succi was betrayed by the fear, or the misconduct, of Maurus; and the Barbarians, who no longer had any resistance to apprehend from the scattered and vanquished troops of the East, spread themselves over the face of a fertile and cultivated country, as far as the confines of Italy, and the Adriatic Sea.[3]

The Romans, who so coolly, and so concisely, mention the acts of *justice* which were exercised by the legions,[4] reserve their compassion, and their eloquence, for their own sufferings, when (A.D. 378, 379) the provinces were invaded, and desolated, by the arms of the successful Barbarians. The simple circumstantial narrative (did such a narrative exist) of the ruin of a single town, of the misfortunes of a single family,[5] might exhibit an interesting and instructive picture of human manners: but the tedious repetition of vague and declamatory complaints would fatigue the attention of the most patient reader. The same censure may be applied, though not perhaps in an equal degree, to the profane, and the ecclesiastical, writers of this unhappy period; that their minds were inflamed by popular and religious animosity, and, that the true size and colour of every object is falsified by the exaggerations of their corrupt eloquence. The vehement Jerom[6] might justly deplore the calamities inflicted by the Goths, and their barbarous al-

[1] Valens had gained, or rather purchased, the friendship of the Saracens, whose vexatious inroads were felt on the borders of Phœnicia, Palestine, and Egypt. The Christian faith had been lately introduced among a people, reserved, in a future age, to propagate another religion (Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 104. 141. Mem. Eccles. vii. 593.).

[2] Crinitus quidam, nudus omnia præter pubem, subraucum et lugubre strepens. Ammian. xxxi. 16. and Vales. ad loc. The Arabs often fought naked; a custom which may be ascribed to their sultry climate, and ostentatious bravery. The description of this unknown savage is the lively portrait of Derar, a name so dreadful to the Christians of Syria. Ockley's Hist. of the Saracens, i. 72. 84. 87.

[3] The series of events may still be traced in the last pages of Ammian. (xxxi. 15, 16.). Zos. (l. iv. 227. 231.), whom we are now reduced to cherish, misplaces the sally of the Arabs before the death of Valens. Eunap. (in Excerpt. Leg. 20.) praises the fertility of Thrace, Macedonia, &c.

[4] Observe with how much indifference Cæsar relates, in the Commentaries of the Gallic war; *that* he put to death the whole senate of the Veneti, who had yielded to his mercy (iii. 16.); *that* he laboured to extirpate the whole nation of the Eburones (vi. 31.); *that* 40,000 persons were massacred at Bourges by the just revenge of his soldiers, who spared neither age nor sex (vii. 27.), &c.

[5] Such are the accounts of the sack of Magdeburgh, by the ecclesiastic and the fisherman, which Mr. Harte has transcribed (Hist. of Gust. Adolphus, i. 313.), with some apprehension of violating the *dignity* of history.

[6] Et vastatis urbibus, hominibusque interfectis, solitudinem et *raritatem bestiarum* quoque fieri, et *volatilium, pisciumque:* testis Illyricum est, testis Thracia, testis in quo ortus sum solum (Pannonia); ubi præter cœlum et terram, et crescentes vepres, et condensa sylvarum *cuncta perierunt*, vii. 250. ad 1 Cap. Sophonias; and i. 26.

lies, on his native country of Pannonia, and the wide extent of the provinces, from the walls of Constantinople to the foot of the Julian Alps; the rapes, the massacres, the conflagrations; and, above all, the profanation of the churches, that were turned into stables, and the contemptuous treatment of the relics of holy martyrs. But the Saint is surely transported beyond the limits of nature and history, when he affirms, "that, in those desert countries, nothing was left except the "sky and the earth; that, after the destruction of the cities, and the "extirpation of the human race, the land was overgrown with thick "forests, and inextricable brambles; and that the universal desolation, "announced by the prophet Zephaniah, was accomplished, in the "scarcity of the beasts, the birds, and even of the fish." These complaints were pronounced about twenty years after the death of Valens; and the Illyrian provinces, which were constantly exposed to the invasion and passage of the Barbarians, still continued, after a calamitous period of ten centuries, to supply new materials for rapine and destruction. Could it even be supposed, that a large tract of country had been left without cultivation and without inhabitants, the consequences might not have been so fatal to the inferior productions of animated nature. The useful and feeble animals, which are nourished by the hand of man, might suffer and perish, if they were deprived of his protection: but the beasts of the forest, his enemies, or his victims, would multiply in the free and undisturbed possession of their solitary domain. The various tribes that people the air, or the waters, are still less connected with the fate of the human species; and it is highly probable, that the fish of the Danube would have felt more terror and distress, from the approach of a voracious pike, than from the hostile inroad of a Gothic army.

Whatever may have been the just measure of the calamities of Europe, there was reason to fear that the same calamities would soon extend (A.D. 378) to the peaceful countries of Asia. The sons of the Goths had been judiciously distributed through the cities of the East; and the arts of education were employed, to polish, and subdue, the native fierceness of their temper. In the space of about twelve years, their numbers had continually increased; and the children, who, in the first emigration, were sent over the Hellespont, had attained, with rapid growth, the strength and spirit of perfect manhood.[1] It was impossible to conceal from their knowledge the events of the Gothic war; and as those daring youths had not studied the language of dissimulation, they betrayed their wish, their desire, perhaps their intention, to emulate the glorious example of their fathers. The danger of the times seemed to justify the jealous suspicions of the provincials; and these suspicions were admitted as unquestionable evidence, that the Goths of Asia had formed a secret and dangerous conspiracy against the public safety. The death of Valens had left the East without a sovereign; and Julius, who filled the important station of master-general of the troops, with a high reputation of diligence and ability, thought it his duty to consult the senate of Constantinople;

[1] Eunap. (Excerpt. Legat. p. 20.) foolishly supposes a præternatural growth of the young Goths; that he may introduce Cadmus's armed men, who sprung from the dragon's teeth, &c Such was the Greek eloquence of the times.

which he considered, during the vacancy of the throne, as the representative council of the nation. As soon as he had obtained the discretionary power of acting as he should judge most expedient for the good of the republic, he assembled the principal officers; and privately concerted effectual measures for the execution of his bloody design. An order was immediately promulgated, that, on a stated day, the Gothic youth should assemble in the capital cities of their respective provinces; and as a report was industriously circulated, that they were summoned to receive a liberal gift of lands and money, the pleasing hope allayed the fury of their resentment, and perhaps suspended the motions of the conspiracy. On the appointed day, the unarmed crowd of the Gothic youth was carefully collected in the square, or Forum: the streets and avenues were occupied by the Roman troops; and the roofs of the houses were covered with archers and slingers. At the same hour, in all the cities of the East, the signal was given of indiscriminate slaughter; and the provinces of Asia were delivered, by the cruel prudence of Julius, from a domestic enemy, who, in a few months, might have carried fire and sword from the Hellespont to the Euphrates.[1] The urgent consideration of the public safety may undoubtedly authorize the violation of every positive law. How far that, or any other, consideration, may operate, to dissolve the natural obligations of humanity and justice, is a doctrine of which I still desire to remain ignorant.

The emperor Gratian was far advanced on his march towards the plains of Hadrianople, when he was informed, at first by the confused voice of fame, and afterwards by the more accurate reports of Victor and Richomer, that his impatient colleague had been slain in battle, and that two-thirds of the Roman army were exterminated by the sword of the victorious Goths. Whatever resentment the rash and jealous vanity of his uncle might deserve, the resentment of a generous mind is easily subdued by the softer emotions of grief and compassion: and even the sense of pity was soon lost in the serious and alarming consideration of the state of the republic. Gratian was too late to assist, he was too weak to revenge, his unfortunate colleague: and the valiant and modest youth felt himself unequal to the support of a sinking world. A formidable tempest of the Barbarians of Germany seemed ready to burst over the provinces of Gaul: and the mind of Gratian was oppressed, and distracted, by the administration of the Western empire. In this important crisis, the government of the East, and the conduct of the Gothic war, required the undivided attention of a hero and a statesman. A subject invested with such ample command would not long have preserved his fidelity to a distant benefactor; and the Imperial council embraced the wise and manly resolution, of conferring an obligation, rather than of yielding to an insult. It was the wish of Gratian to bestow the purple as the reward of virtue; but, at the age of nineteen, it is not easy for a prince, educated in the supreme rank, to understand the true characters of his ministers and generals.

[1] Ammianus evidently approves this execution, efficacia velox et salutaris, which concludes his work (xxxi. 16.). Zozimus, who is curious and copious (l. iv. 233.), mistakes the date, and labours to find the reason, why Julius did not consult the emperor Theodosius, who had not yet ascended the throne of the East.

He attempted to weigh, with an impartial hand, their various merits and defects; and, whilst he checked the rash confidence of ambition, he distrusted the cautious wisdom, which despaired of the republic. As each moment of delay diminished something of the power and resources of the future sovereign of the East, the situation of the times would not allow a tedious debate. The choice of Gratian was soon declared in favour of an exile, whose father, only three years before, had suffered, under the sanction of *his* authority, an unjust and ignominious death. The great Theodosius, a name celebrated in history, and dear to the Catholic Church,[1] was summoned to the Imperial court, which had gradually retreated from the confines of Thrace to the more secure station of Sirmium. Five months after the death of Valens, the emperor Gratian produced (A.D. 379. Jan. 19) before the assembled troops, *his* colleague and *their* master; who, after a modest, perhaps a sincere, resistance, was compelled to accept, amidst the general acclamations, the diadem, the purple, and the equal title of Augustus.[2] The provinces of Thrace, Asia, and Egypt, over which Valens had reigned, were resigned to the administration of the new emperor: but, as he was specially entrusted with the conduct of the Gothic war, the Illyrian præfecture was dismembered; and the two great dioceses of Dacia and Macedonia were added to the dominions of the Eastern empire.—*Tillemont*, *Hist. des Emp.* v. 716.

The same province, and, perhaps, the same city,[3] which had given to the throne the virtues of Trajan, and the talents of Hadrian, was the original seat of another family of Spaniards, who, in a less fortunate age, possessed, near fourscore years, the declining empire of Rome.[4] They emerged from the obscurity of municipal honours by the active spirit of the elder Theodosius, a general, whose exploits in Britain and Africa have formed one of the most splendid parts of the annals of Valentinian. The son of that general, who likewise bore the name of Theodosius, was educated, by skilful preceptors, in the liberal studies of youth; but he was instructed in the art of war by the tender care and severe discipline of his father.[5] Under the standard of such a leader, young Theodosius sought glory and knowledge, in the most distant scenes of military action; inured his constitution to the difference of seasons and climates; distinguished his valour by sea and

[1] A Life of Theodosius the Great was composed in the last century (Paris, 1679, 4to; 1680, 12mo), to inflame the mind of the young Dauphin with Catholic zeal. The author, Flechier, afterwards bishop of Nismes, was a celebrated preacher; and his history is adorned, or tainted, with pulpit-eloquence; but he takes his learning from Baronius, and his principles from St. Ambrose and St. Augustin.

[2] The birth, character, and elevation of Theodosius, are marked in Pacatus (in Panegyr. Vet. xii. 10.), Themist. (Orat. xiv. 182.), Zos. (l. iv. p. 231.), Augustin (de Civ. Dei, v. 25.), Oros. (l. vii. c. 34.), Soz. (l. vii. c. 2.), Socr. (l. v. c. 2.), Theod. (l. v. c. 5.), Philostorg. (l. ix. c. 17. with Godefroy, p. 393.), the Epitome of Victor, and the Chronicles of Prosper, Idatius, and Marcellinus, in the Thesaurus Temporum of Scaliger.

[3] *Italica*, founded by Scipio Africanus for his wounded veterans of *Italy*. The ruins still appear, about a league above Seville, but on the opposite bank of the river. Hispan. Illustrata of Nonius, a short, though valuable, treatise. C. xvii. p. 64.

[4] I agree with Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 726.) in suspecting the royal pedigree, which remained a secret till the promotion of Theodosius. Even after that event, the silence of Pacatus outweighs the venal evidence of Themistius, Victor, and Claudian, who connect the family of Theodosius with the blood of Trajan and Hadrian.

[5] Pacatus compares, and consequently prefers, the youth of Theodosius, to the military education of Alexander, Hannibal, and the second Africanus; who, like him, had served under their fathers (xii. 8.).

land; and observed the various warfare of the Scots, the Saxons, and the Moors. His own merit, and the recommendation of the conqueror of Africa, soon raised him to a separate command: and, in the station of Duke of Mæsia, he vanquished an army of Sarmatians; saved the province; deserved the love of the soldiers; and provoked the envy of the court.[1] His rising fortunes were soon blasted by the disgrace and execution of his illustrious father; and Theodosius obtained, as a favour, the permission of retiring to a private life, in his native province of Spain. He displayed a firm and temperate character in the ease with which he adapted himself to this new situation. His time was almost equally divided between the town and country: the spirit, which had animated his public conduct, was shown in the active and affectionate performance of every social duty; and the diligence of the soldier was profitably converted to the improvement of his ample patrimony,[2] which lay between Valladolid and Segovia, in the midst of a fruitful district, still famous for a most exquisite breed of sheep.[3] From the innocent, but humble, labours of his farm, Theodosius was transported, in less than four months, to the throne of the Eastern empire: and the whole period of the history of the world will not perhaps afford a similar example of an elevation, at the same time, so pure, and so honourable. The princes who peaceably inherit the sceptre of their fathers, claim and enjoy a legal right, the more secure, as it is absolutely distinct from the merits of their personal characters. The subjects, who, in a monarchy, or a popular state, acquire the possession of supreme power, may have raised themselves, by the superiority either of genius or virtue, above the heads of their equals: but their virtue is seldom exempt from ambition; and the cause of the successful candidate is frequently stained by the guilt of conspiracy, or civil war. Even in those governments which allow the reigning monarch to declare a colleague, or a successor, his partial choice, which may be influenced by the blindest passions, is often directed to an unworthy object. But the most suspicious malignity cannot ascribe to Theodosius, in his obscure solitude of Caucha, the arts, the desires, or even the hopes, of an ambitious statesman; and the name of the Exile would long since have been forgotten, if his genuine and distinguished virtues had not left a deep impression in the Imperial court. During the season of prosperity, he had been neglected; but, in the public distress, his superior merit was universally felt and acknowledged. What confidence must have been reposed in his integrity, since Gratian could trust, that a pious son would forgive, for the sake of the republic, the murder of his father! What expectations must have been formed of his abilities, to encourage the hope, that a single man could save, and restore, the empire of the East! Theodosius was invested with the purple in the thirty-third year of his

[1] Ammian. (xxix. 6.) mentions this victory of Theodosius Junior Dux Mæsiæ, primâ etiam tum lanugine juvenis, princeps postea perspectissimus. The same fact is attested by Themistius and Zosimus: but Theod. (l. v. c. 5.), who adds some curious circumstances, strangely applies it to the time of the Interregnum.

[2] Pacatus (in Paneg. Vet. xii. 9.) prefers the rustic life of Theodosius to that of Cincinnatus: the one was the effect of choice, the other of poverty.

[3] D'Anville (Geog. Anc. i. 25.) has fixed the situation of Caucha, or Coca, in the old province of Gallicia, where Zosimus and Idatius have placed the birth, or patrimony, of Theodosius.

age. The vulgar gazed with admiration on the manly beauty of his face, and the graceful majesty of his person, which they were pleased to compare with the pictures and medals of the emperor Trajan; whilst intelligent observers discovered, in the qualities of his heart and understanding, a more important resemblance to the best and greatest of the Roman princes.

It is not without the most sincere regret, that I must now take leave of an accurate and faithful guide, who has composed the history of his own times, without indulging the prejudices and passions, which usually affect the mind of a contemporary. Ammianus Marcellinus, who terminates his useful work with the defeat and death of Valens, recommends the more glorious subject of the ensuing reign to the youthful vigour and eloqueuce of the rising generation.[1] The rising generation was not disposed to accept his advice, or to imitate his example;[2] and, in the study of the reign of Theodosius, we are reduced to illustrate the partial narrative of Zosimus, by the obscure hints of fragments and chronicles, by the figurative style of poetry or panegyric, and by the precarious assistance of the ecclesiastical writers, who, in the heat of religious faction, are apt to despise the profane virtues of sincerity and moderation. Conscious of these disadvantages, which will continue to involve a considerable portion of the decline and fall of the Roman empire, I shall proceed with doubtful and timorous steps. Yet I may boldly pronounce, that the battle of Hadrianople was never revenged by any signal or decisive victory of Theodosius over the Barbarians; and the expressive silence of his venal orators may be confirmed by the observation of the condition and circumstances of the times. The fabric of a mighty state, which has been reared by the labours of successive ages, could not be overturned by the misfortune of a single day, if the fatal power of the imagination did not exaggerate the real measure of the calamity. The loss of 40,000 Romans, who fell in the plains of Hadrianople, might have been soon recruited in the populous provinces of the East, which contained so many millions of inhabitants. The courage of a soldier is found to be the cheapest, and most common, quality of human nature; and sufficient skill to encounter an undisciplined foe, might have been speedily taught by the care of the surviving centurions. If the Barbarians were mounted on the horses, and equipped with the armour, of their vanquished enemies, the numerous studs of Cappadocia and Spain would have supplied new squadrons of cavalry; the thirty-four arsenals of the empire were plentifully stored with magazines of offensive and defensive arms; and the wealth of Asia might still have yielded an ample fund for the expences of the war. But the effects which were produced by the battle of Hadrianople on the minds of the Barbarians, and of the Romans,

[1] Let us hear Ammianus himself. Hæc, ut miles quondam et Græcus, a principatu Cæsaris Nervæ exorsus, adusque Valentis interitum, pro virium explicavi mensurâ: nunquam, ut arbitror, sciens, silentio ausus corrumpere vel mendacio. Scribant reliqua potiores ætate, doctrinisque florentes. Quos id, si libuerit, aggressuros, procudere linguas ad majores moneo stilos. Ammian. xxxi. 16. The first thirteen books, a superficial epitome of 257 years, are now lost: the last eighteen, which contain no more than 25 years, still preserve the copious and authentic history of his own times.

[2] Ammianus was the last subject of Rome who composed a profane history in the Latin language. The East, in the next century, produced some rhetorical historians, Zosimus, Olympiodorus, Malchus, Candidus, &c. Vossius de Histor. Græcis, l. ii. c. 18. de Histor. Latinis, l. ii. c. 10, &c.

extended the victory of the former, and the defeat of the latter, far beyond the limits of a single day. A Gothic chief was heard to declare, with insolent moderation, that, for his own part, he was fatigued with slaughter; but that he was astonished how a people, who fled before him like a flock of sheep, could still presume to dispute the possession of their treasures and provinces.[1] The same terrors, which the name of the Huns had spread among the Gothic tribes, were inspired, by the formidable name of the Goths, among the subjects and soldiers of the Roman empire.—*Eunap. Excerpt. Leg.* p. 21. If Theodosius, hastily collecting his scattered forces, had led them into the field to encounter a victorious enemy, his army would have been vanquished by their own fears; and his rashness could not have been excused by the chance of success. But the *great* Theodosius, an epithet which he honourably deserved on this momentous occasion, conducted himself as the firm and faithful guardian of the republic. He fixed his head-quarters at Thessalonica, the capital of the Macedonian diocese;[2] from whence he could watch the irregular motions of the Barbarians, and direct the operations of his lieutenants, from the gates of Constantinople to the shores of the Adriatic. The fortifications and garrisons of the cities were strengthened; and the troops, among whom a sense of order and discipline was revived, were insensibly emboldened by the confidence of their own safety. From these secure stations, they were encouraged to make frequent sallies on the Barbarians, who infested the adjacent country; and, as they were seldom allowed to engage, without some decisive superiority, either of ground or of numbers, their enterprises were, for the most part, successful; and they were soon convinced, by their own experience, of the possibility of vanquishing their *invincible* enemies. The detachments of these separate garrisons were gradually united into small armies; the same cautious measures were pursued, according to an extensive and well-concerted plan of operations; the events of each day added strength and spirit to the Roman arms; and the artful diligence of the emperor, who circulated the most favourable reports of the success of the war, contributed to subdue the pride of the Barbarians, and to animate the hopes and courage of his subjects. If, instead of this faint and imperfect outline, we could accurately represent the counsels and actions of Theodosius, in four successive campaigns (A.D. 379—382), there is reason to believe, that his consummate skill would deserve the applause of every military reader. The republic had formerly been saved by the delays of Fabius: and, while the splendid trophies of Scipio, in the field of Zama, attract the eyes of posterity, the camps and marches of the dictator among the hills of Campania, may claim a juster proportion of the solid and independent fame, which the general is not compelled to share, either with fortune or with his troops. Such was likewise the merit of Theodosius; and the infirmities of his body, which most unseasonably languished under a long and dangerous dis-

[1] Chrysostom, i. 344. ed. Montfaucon. I have verified, and examined, this passage: but I should never, without the aid of Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 152.) have detected an historical anecdote, in a strange medley of moral and mystic exhortations, addressed, by the preacher of Antioch, to a young widow.

[2] Godefroy's Chronology of the Laws. Codex Theod. i. Prolegomen. p. xcix—civ.

ease, could not oppress the vigour of his mind, or divert his attention from the public service.[1]

The deliverance and peace of the Roman provinces[2] was the work of prudence, rather than of valour: the prudence of Theodosius was seconded by fortune; and the emperor never failed to seize, and to improve, every favourable circumstance. As long as the superior genius of Fritigern preserved the union, and directed the motions, of the Barbarians, their power was not inadequate to the conquest of a great empire. The death of that hero, the predecessor and master of the renowned Alaric, relieved an impatient multitude from the intolerable yoke of discipline and discretion. The Barbarians, who had been restrained by his authority, abandoned themselves to the dictates of their passions; and their passions were seldom uniform, or consistent. An army of conquerors was broken into many disorderly bands of savage robbers; and their blind and irregular fury was not less pernicious to themselves, than to their enemies. Their mischievous disposition was shown in the destruction of every object, which they wanted strength to remove, or taste to enjoy; and they often consumed with improvident rage, the harvests, or the granaries, which soon afterwards became necessary for their own subsistence. A spirit of discord arose among the independent tribes and nations, which had been united only by the bands of a loose and voluntary alliance. The troops of the Huns and the Alani would naturally upbraid the flight of the Goths; who were not disposed to use with moderation the advantages of their fortune: the ancient jealousy of the Ostrogoths and the Visigoths could not long be suspended; and the haughty chiefs still remembered the insults and injuries, which they had reciprocally offered, or sustained, while the nation was seated in the countries beyond the Danube. The progress of domestic faction abated the more diffusive sentiment of national animosity; and the officers of Theodosius were instructed to purchase, with liberal gifts and promises, the retreat, or service, of the discontented party. The acquisition of Modar, a prince of the royal blood of the Amali, gave a bold and faithful champion to the cause of Rome. The illustrious deserter soon obtained the rank of master-general, with an important command; surprised an army of his countrymen, who were immersed in wine and sleep; and, after a cruel slaughter of the astonished Goths, returned with an immense spoil, and 4000 waggons, to the Imperial camp.[3] In the hands of a skilful politician, the most different means may be successfully applied to the same ends: and the peace of the empire, which had been forwarded by the divisions, was accomplished by the re-union, of the Gothic nation. Athanaric, who had been a patient spectator of these extraordinary events, was at length driven, by the chance of arms, from the dark recesses of the woods of Cauca-

[1] Most writers insist on the illness, and long repose, of Theodosius, at Thessalonica: Zosimus, to diminish his glory; Jornandes, to favour the Goths; and the ecclesiastical writers, to introduce his baptism.

[2] Compare Themist. (Orat. xiv. p. 181.) with Zos. (l. iv. 232.), Jornan. (c. xxvii. 649.), and the prolix Commentary of M. de Buat (Hist. des Peup. vi. 477.). The Chronicles of Idatius and Marcellinus allude, in general terms, to, magna certamina, *magna multaque* prælia. The two epithets are not easily reconciled.

[3] Zos. (l. iv. p. 232.) styles him a Scythian, a name which the more recent Greeks seem to have appropriated to the Goths.

land. He no longer hesitated to pass (A.D. 381. Jan. 25) the Danube; and a very considerable part of the subjects of Fritigern, who already felt the inconveniences of anarchy, were easily persuaded to acknowledge for their king, a Gothic judge, whose birth they respected, and whose abilities they had frequently experienced. But age had chilled the daring spirit of Athanaric; and, instead of leading his people to the field of battle and victory, he wisely listened to the fair proposal of an honourable and advantageous treaty. Theodosius, who was acquainted with the merit and power of his new ally, condescended to meet him at the distance of several miles from Constantinople; and entertained him in the Imperial city, with the confidence of a friend, and the magnificence of a monarch. "The Barbarian prince ob-"served, with curious attention, the variety of objects which attracted "his notice, and at last broke out into a sincere and passionate ex-"clamation of wonder. I now behold, said he, what I never could "believe, the glories of this stupendous capital! and as he cast his "eyes around, he viewed, and he admired, the commanding situation "of the city, the strength and beauty of the walls and public edifices, "the capacious harbour, crowded with innumerable vessels, the per-"petual concourse of distant nations, and the arms and discipline of "the troops. Indeed, continued Athanaric, the emperor of the Romans "is a god upon earth; and the presumptuous man, who dares to lift "his hand against him, is guilty of his own blood."[1] The Gothic king did not long enjoy this splendid and honourable reception; and, as temperance was not the virtue of his nation, it may justly be suspected, that his mortal disease was contracted amidst the pleasures of the Imperial banquets. But the policy of Theodosius derived more solid benefit from the death, than he could have expected from the most faithful services, of his ally. The funeral of Athanaric was performed with solemn rites in the capital of the East; a stately monument was erected to his memory; and his whole army, won by the liberal courtesy, and decent grief, of Theodosius, enlisted under the standard of the Roman empire.[2] The submission of so great a body of the Visigoths was productive of the most salutary consequences; and the mixed influence of force, of reason, and of corruption, became every day more powerful, and more extensive. Each independent chieftain hastened to obtain a separate treaty, from the apprehension that an obstinate delay might expose *him*, alone and unprotected, to the revenge, or justice, of the conqueror. The general, or rather the final, capitulation of the Goths, may be dated (A.D. 382. Oct. 3) four years, one month, and 25 days, after the defeat and death of the emperor Valens.[3]

[1] The reader will not be displeased to see the original words of Jornandes, or the author whom he transcribed. Regiam urbem ingressus est, miransque, En, inquit, cerno quod sæpe incredulus audiebam, famam videlicet tantæ urbis. Et huc illuc oculos volvens, nunc situm urbis commeatumque navium, nunc mœnia clara prospectans, miratur; populosque diversarum gentium, quasi fonte in uno e diversis partibus scaturiente undâ, sic quoque militem ordinatum aspiciens. Deus, inquit, est sine dubio terrenus Imperator, et quisquis adversus eum manum moverit, ipse sui sanguinis reus existit. Jornan. (c. xxviii. 650.) proceeds to mention his death and funeral.

[2] Jornan. c. xxviii. p. 650. Even Zos. (l. iv. p. 246.) is compelled to approve the generosity of Theodosius, so honourable to himself, and so beneficial to the public.

[3] The short, but authentic, hints in the *Fasti* of Idatius (Chron. Scaliger, p. 52.) are stained

The provinces of the Danube had been already relieved from the oppressive weight of the Gruthungi, or Ostrogoths, by the voluntary retreat of Alatheus and Saphrax; whose restless spirit had prompted them to seek new scenes of rapine and glory. Their destructive course was pointed towards the West; but we must be satisfied with a very obscure and imperfect knowledge of their various adventures. The Ostrogoths impelled several of the German tribes on the provinces of Gaul; concluded, and soon violated, a treaty with the emperor Gratian; advanced into the unknown countries of the North; and, after an interval of more than four years, returned, with accumulated force, to the banks of the Lower Danube. Their troops were recruited with the fiercest warriors of Germany and Scythia; and the soldiers, or at least the historians, of the empire, no longer recognized the name and countenances of their former enemies.[1] The general, who commanded the military and naval powers of the Thracian frontier, soon perceived that his superiority would be disadvantageous to the public service; and that the Barbarians, awed by the presence of his fleet and legions, would probably defer the passage of the river till the approaching winter. The dexterity of the spies, whom he sent into the Gothic camp, allured the Barbarians into a fatal snare. They were persuaded, that, by a bold attempt, they might surprise, in the silence and darkness of the night, the sleeping army of the Romans; and the whole multitude was hastily embarked in a fleet of 3000 canoes.[2] The bravest of the Ostrogoths led the van; the main body consisted of the remainder of their subjects and soldiers; and the women and children securely followed in the rear. One of the nights without a moon (A. D. 386. Oct.) had been selected for the execution of their design; and they had almost reached the southern bank of the Danube, in the firm confidence that they should find an easy landing, and an unguarded camp. But the progress of the Barbarians was suddenly stopped by an unexpected obstacle; a triple line of vessels, strongly connected with each other, and which formed an impenetrable chain of two miles and a half along the river. While they struggled to force their way in the unequal conflict, their right flank was overwhelmed by the irresistible attack of a fleet of gallies, which were urged down the stream by the united impulse of oars and of the tide. The weight and velocity of those ships of war broke, and sunk, and dispersed, the rude and feeble canoes of the Barbarians: their valour was ineffectual; and Alatheus, the king, or general, of the Ostrogoths, perished, with his bravest troops, either by the sword of the Romans, or in the waves of the Danube. The last division of this unfortunate fleet might regain the opposite shore: but the distress and disorder of the multitude rendered them alike incapable, either of action or counsel; and they soon implored the clemency of the victorious enemy. On this occasion, as

with contemporary passion. The fourteenth oration of Themistius is a compliment to Peace, and the consul Saturninus (A.D. 383.).

[1] *Εθνος το Σκυθικον πασιν αγνωστον.* Zos. l. iv. 252.

[2] I am justified, by reason and example, in applying this Indian name to the *μονοξυλα* of the Barbarians, the single trees hollowed into the shape of a boat, *πληθει μονοξυλων εμβιβασαντες.* Zos. l. iv. 253.

Ausi Danubium quondam tranare Gruthungi
In lintres fregere nemus: ter mille ruebant
Per fluvium plenæ cuneis immanibus alui.
Claudian. in iv. Cons. Hon. 623.

well as on many others, it is a difficult task to reconcile the passions and prejudices of the writers of the age of Theodosius. The partial and malignant historian, who misrepresents every action of his reign, affirms, that the emperor did not appear in the field of battle till the Barbarians had been vanquished by the valour and conduct of his lieutenant Promotus.[1] The flattering poet, who celebrated, in the court of Honorius, the glory of the father and of the son, ascribes the victory to the personal prowess of Theodosius; and almost insinuates, that the king of the Ostrogoths was slain by the hand of the emperor.[2] The truth of history might perhaps be found in a just medium between these extreme and contradictory assertions.

The original treaty which fixed the settlement of the Goths, ascertained their privileges, and stipulated their obligations, would illustrate the history of Theodosius and his successors. The series of their history has imperfectly preserved the spirit and substance of this singular agreement.[3] The ravages of war and tyranny had provided many large tracts of fertile, but uncultivated land, for the use of those Barbarians, who might not disdain the practice of agriculture. A numerous colony of the Visigoths was seated in Thrace; the remains of the Ostrogoths were planted in Phrygia and Lydia; their immediate wants were supplied by a distribution of corn and cattle; and their future industry was encouraged by an exemption from tribute, during a certain term of years (A. D. 383—395). The Barbarians would have deserved to feel the cruel and perfidious policy of the Imperial court, if they had suffered themselves to be dispersed through the provinces. They required, and they obtained, the sole possession of the villages and districts assigned for their residence; they still cherished and propagated their native manners and language; asserted, in the bosom of despotism, the freedom of their domestic government; and acknowledged the sovereignty of the emperor, without submitting to the inferior jurisdiction of the laws and magistrates of Rome. The hereditary chiefs of the tribes and families were still permitted to command their followers in peace and war; but the royal dignity was abolished; and the generals of the Goths were appointed and removed at the pleasure of the emperor. An army of 40,000 Goths was maintained for the perpetual service of the empire of the East; and those haughty troops, who assumed the title of *Fœderati*, or allies, were distinguished by their gold collars, liberal pay, and licentious privileges. Their native courage was improved by the use of arms, and the knowledge of discipline; and, while the republic was guarded, or threatened, by the doubtful sword of the Barbarians, the last sparks of the military flame

[1] Zos. l. iv. 252. He too frequently betrays his poverty of judgment, by disgracing the most serious narratives with trifling and incredible circumstances.

[2] ——— Odothæi Regis *opima* Retulit ——— Ver. 632.

The *opima* were the spoils, which a Roman general could only win from the king, or general, of the enemy, whom he had slain with his own hands: and no more than three such examples are celebrated in the victorious ages of Rome.

[3] Themistius, Orat. xvi. p. 211. Claudian (in Eutrop. l. ii. 152.) mentions the Phrygian colony:

———Ostrogothis colitur mistisque Gruthungis Phryx ager———

and then proceeds to name the rivers of Lydia, the Pactolus, and Hermus.

were finally extinguished in the minds of the Romans.[1] Theodosius had the address to persuade his allies, that the conditions of peace which had been extorted from him by prudence and necessity, were the voluntary expressions of his sincere friendship for the Gothic nation.[2] A different mode of vindication or apology was opposed to the complaints of the people; who loudly censured these shameful and dangerous concessions.[3] The calamities of the war were painted in the most lively colours; and the first symptoms of the return of order, of plenty, and security, were diligently exaggerated. The advocates of Theodosius could affirm, with some appearance of truth and reason, that it was impossible to extirpate so many warlike tribes, who were rendered desperate by the loss of their native country; and that the exhausted provinces would be revived by a fresh supply of soldiers and husbandmen. The Barbarians still wore an angry and hostile aspect; but the experience of past times might encourage the hope, that they would acquire the habits of industry and obedience; that their manners would be polished by time, education, and the influence of Christianity; and that their posterity would insensibly blend with the great body of the Roman people.[4]

Notwithstanding these specious arguments, and these sanguine expectations, it was apparent to every discerning eye, that the Goths would long remain the enemies, and might soon become the conquerors, of the Roman empire. Their rude and insolent behaviour expressed their contempt of the citizens and provincials, whom they insulted with impunity.[5] To the zeal and valour of the Barbarians, Theodosius was indebted for the success of his arms: but their assistance was precarious; and they were sometimes seduced, by a treacherous and inconstant disposition, to abandon his standard, at the moment when their service was the most essential. During the civil war against Maximus, a great number of Gothic deserters retired into the morasses of Macedonia, wasted the adjacent provinces, and obliged the intrepid monarch to expose his person, and exert his power, to suppress the rising flame of rebellion.[6] The public apprehensions were fortified by the strong suspicion, that these tumults were not the effect of accidental passion, but the result of deep and premeditated design. It was generally believed, that the

[1] Compare Jornan. (c. xx. 27.), who marks the condition and number of the Gothic *Fœderati*, with Zos. (l. iv. 258.), who mentions their golden collars; and Pacatus (in Paneg. Vet. xii. 37.), who applauds, with false or foolish joy, their bravery and discipline.

[2] Amator pacis generisque Gothorum, is the praise bestowed by the Gothic historian (c. xxix.), who represents his nation as innocent, peaceable men, slow to anger, and patient of injuries. According to Livy, the Romans conquered the world in their own defence.

[3] Besides the partial invectives of Zosimus (always discontented with the Christian reigns), see the grave representations which Synesius addresses to the emperor Arcadius (de Regno, p. 25, ed. Petav.). The philosophic bishop of Cyrene was near enough to judge; and he was sufficiently removed from the temptation of fear or flattery.

[4] Themist. (Orat. xvi. 211.) composes an elaborate and rational apology, which is not, however, exempt from the puerilities of the Greek rhetoric. Orpheus could *only* charm the wild beasts of Thrace: but Theodosius enchanted the men and women, whose predecessors in the same country had torn Orpheus in pieces, &c.

[5] Constantinople was deprived, half a day, of the public allowance of bread, to expiate the murder of a Gothic soldier: κινουντες το Σκυθικον was the guilt of the people. Liban. Orat. xii. 394. ed. Morel.

[6] Zos. l. iv. 267. He tells a long and ridiculous story of the adventurous prince, who roved the country with only five horsemen, of a spy whom they detected, whipped, and killed in an old woman's cottage, &c.

Goths had signed the treaty of peace with an hostile and insidious spirit; and that their chiefs had previously bound themselves, by a solemn and secret oath, never to keep faith with the Romans; to maintain the fairest show of loyalty and friendship, and to watch the favourable moment of rapine, of conquest, and of revenge. But, as the minds of the Barbarians were not insensible to the power of gratitude, several of the Gothic leaders sincerely devoted themselves to the service of the empire, or, at least, of the emperor: the whole nation was insensibly divided into two opposite factions, and much sophistry was employed in conversation and dispute, to compare the obligations of their first, and second, engagements. The Goths, who considered themselves as the friends of peace, of justice, and of Rome, were directed by the authority of Fravitta, a valiant and honourable youth, distinguished above the rest of his countrymen, by the politeness of his manners, the liberality of his sentiments, and the mild virtues of social life. But the more numerous faction adhered to the fierce and faithless Priulf, who inflamed the passions, and asserted the independence, of his warlike followers. On one of the solemn festivals, when the chiefs of both parties were invited to the Imperial table, they were insensibly heated by wine, till they forgot the usual restraints of discretion and respect; and betrayed in the presence of Theodosius, the fatal secret of their domestic disputes. The emperor, who had been the reluctant witness of this extraordinary controversy, dissembled his fears and resentment, and soon dismissed the tumultuous assembly. Fravitta, alarmed and exasperated by the insolence of his rival, whose departure from the palace might have been the signal of a civil war, boldly followed him; and, drawing his sword, laid Priulf dead at his feet. Their companions flew to arms; and the faithful champion of Rome would have been oppressed by superior numbers, if he had not been protected by the seasonable interposition of the Imperial guards.[1] Such were the scenes of Barbaric rage, which disgraced the palace and table of the Roman emperor; and, as the impatient Goths could only be restrained by the firm and temperate character of Theodosius, the public safety seemed to depend on the life and abilities of a single man.[2]

[1] Compare Eunap. (Excerpt. Leg. p. 21.) with Zos. (l. iv. 279.). The difference of circumstances and names must undoubtedly be applied to the same story. Fravitta, or Travitta, was afterwards consul (A.D. 401.), and still continued his faithful service to the eldest son of Theodosius (Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 467.).

[2] Les Goths ravagerent tout depuis le Danube jusqu'au Bosphore; exterminerent Valens et son armée; et ne repasserent le Danube, que pour abandonner l'affreuse solitude qu'ils avoient faite (Montesquieu, iii. 476; Consid. sur la Grand. et Decad. des Romains, c. xvii.). Montesquieu seems ignorant, that the Goths, after the defeat of Valens, *never* abandoned the Roman territory. It is now thirty years, says Claudian (de Bello Getico, 166, &c. A.D. 404.),

> Ex quo jam patrios gens hæc oblita Triones,
> Atque Istrum transvecta semel, vestigia fixit
> Threicio funesta solo———

The error is inexcusable; since it disguises the principal and immediate cause of the fall of the Western Empire of Rome.

CHAPTER XXVII.

Death of Gratian.—Ruin of Arianism.—St. Ambrose.—First civil War, against Maximus.—Character, Administration, and Penance, of Theodosius.—Death of Valentinian II.—*Second civil War, against Eugenius.—Death of Theodosius.*

THE fame of Gratian, before he had accomplished the twentieth year of his age, was equal to that of the most celebrated princes. His gentle and amiable disposition endeared him to his private friends, the graceful affability of his manners engaged the affection of the people: the men of letters, who enjoyed (A.D. 379—383) the liberality, acknowledged the taste and eloquence, of their sovereign; his valour and dexterity in arms, were equally applauded by the soldiers; and the clergy considered the humble piety of Gratian as the first and most useful of his virtues. The victory of Colmar had delivered the West from a formidable invasion; and the grateful provinces of the East ascribed the merits of Theodosius to the author of *his* greatness, and of the public safety. Gratian survived those memorable events only four or five years; but he survived his reputation; and, before he fell a victim to rebellion, he had lost, in a great measure, the respect and confidence of the Roman world.

The remarkable alteration of his character or conduct, may not be imputed to the arts of flattery, which had besieged the son of Valentinian from his infancy; nor to the headstrong passions which that gentle youth appears to have escaped. A more attentive view of the life of Gratian, may perhaps suggest the true cause of the disappointment of the public hopes. His apparent virtues, instead of being the hardy productions of experience and adversity, were the premature and artificial fruits of a royal education. The anxious tenderness of his father was continually employed to bestow on him those advantages, which he might perhaps esteem the more highly, as he himself had been deprived of them; and the most skilful masters of every science, and of every art, had laboured to form the mind and body of the young prince.[1] The knowledge which they painfully communicated was displayed with ostentation, and celebrated with lavish praise. His soft and tractable disposition received the fair impression of their judicious precepts, and the absence of passion might easily be mistaken for the strength of reason. His preceptors gradually rose to the rank and consequence of ministers of state;[2] and, as they wisely dissembled their secret authority, he seemed to act with firmness, with propriety, and with judgment, on the most important occasions of his life and reign. But the influence of this elaborate instruction did not penetrate beyond the surface; and the skilful preceptors, who so ac-

[1] Valentinian was less attentive to the religion of his son; since he entrusted the education of Gratian to Ausonius, a professed Pagan (Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. xv. 125.). The poetical fame of Ausonius condemns the taste of his age.

[2] Ausonius was successively promoted to the Prætorian præfecture of Italy (A.D. 377.), or Gaul (A.D. 378.); and was at length invested with the consulship (A.D. 379.). He expressed his gratitude in a servile and insipid piece of flattery (Actio Gratiarum, p. 699.), which has survived more worthy productions.

curately guided the steps of their royal pupil, could not infuse into his feeble and indolent character, the vigorous and independent principle of action, which renders the laborious pursuit of glory essentially necessary to the happiness, and almost to the existence, of the hero. As soon as time and accident had removed those faithful counsellors from the throne, the emperor of the West insensibly descended to the level of his natural genius; abandoned the reins of government to the ambitious hands which were stretched forwards to grasp them; and amused his leisure with the most frivolous gratifications. A public sale of favour and injustice was instituted, both in the court, and in the provinces, by the worthless delegates of his power, whose merit it was made *sacrilege* to question.[1] The conscience of the credulous prince was directed by saints and bishops;[2] who procured an Imperial edict to punish, as a capital offence, the violation, the neglect, or even the ignorance, of the divine law.[3] Among the various arts which had exercised the youth of Gratian, he had applied himself, with singular inclination and success, to manage the horse, to draw the bow, and to dart the javelin; and these qualifications, which might be useful to a soldier, were prostituted to the viler purposes of hunting. Large parks were inclosed for the Imperial pleasures, and plentifully stocked with every species of wild beasts; and Gratian neglected the duties, and even the dignity, of his rank, to consume whole days in the vain display of his dexterity and boldness in the chace. The pride and wish of the Roman emperor to excel in an art, in which he might be surpassed by the meanest of his slaves, reminded the numerous spectators of the examples of Nero and Commodus: but the chaste and temperate Gratian was a stranger to their monstrous vices; and his hands were stained only with the blood of animals.[4]

The behaviour of Gratian, which degraded his character in the eyes of mankind, could not have disturbed the security of his reign, if the army had not been provoked to resent their peculiar injuries. As long as the young emperor was guided by the instructions of his masters, he professed himself the friend and pupil of the soldiers; many of his hours were spent in the familiar conversation of the camp, and the health, the comforts, the rewards, the honours, of his faithful troops, appeared to be the object of his attentive concern. But, after Gratian more freely indulged his prevailing taste for hunting and shooting, he naturally connected himself with the most dexterous ministers of his favourite amusement. A body of the Alani was received into the military and domestic service of the palace; and the admirable skill, which they were accustomed to display in the unbounded plains of

[1] Disputare de principali judicio non oportet. Sacrilegii enim instar est dubitare, an is dignus sit, quem elegerit imperator. Cod. Just. l. ix. tit. xxix. leg. 3. This convenient law was revived and promulgated, after the death of Gratian, by the feeble court of Milan.

[2] Ambrose composed, for his instruction, a theological treatise on the faith of the Trinity: and Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 158.) ascribes to the archbishop the merit of Gratian's intolerant laws.

[3] Qui divinæ legis sanctitatem nesciendo omittunt, aut negligendo violant, et offendunt sacrilegium committunt. Cod. Just. l. ix. tit. xxix. leg. 1. Theodosius indeed may claim his share, in the merit of this comprehensive law.

[4] Ammian. (xxxi. 10.) and the younger Victor acknowledge the virtues of Gratian; and accuse, or rather lament, his degenerate taste. The odious parallel of Commodus is saved by "licet incruentus;" and perhaps Philostorg. (l. x. c. 10. and Godefroy, p. 412.) had guarded, with some similar reserve, the comparison of Nero.

Scythia, was exercised, on a more narrow theatre, in the parks and inclosures of Gaul. Gratian admired the talents and customs of these favourite guards, to whom alone he intrusted the defence of his person: and, as if he meant to insult the public opinion, he frequently showed himself to the soldiers and people, with the dress and arms, the long bow, the sounding quiver, and the fur garments, of a Scythian warrior. The unworthy spectacle of a Roman prince, who had renounced the dress and manners of his country, filled the minds of the legions with grief and indignation.[1] Even the Germans, so strong and formidable in the armies of the empire, affected to disdain the strange and horrid appearance of the savages of the North, who, in the space of a few years, had wandered from the banks of the Volga to those of the Seine. A loud and licentious murmur was echoed through the camps and garrisons of the West; and as the mild indolence of Gratian neglected to extinguish the first symptoms of discontent, the want of love and respect was not supplied by the influence of fear. But the subversion of an established government is always a work of some real, and of much apparent, difficulty; and the throne of Gratian was protected by the sanctions of custom, law, religion, and the nice balance of the civil and military powers, which had been established by the policy of Constantine. It is not very important to inquire from what causes the revolt of Britain was produced. Accident is commonly the parent of disorder; the seeds of rebellion happened to fall on a soil which was supposed to be more fruitful than any other in tyrants and usurpers;[2] the legions of that sequestered island had been long famous for a spirit of presumption and arrogance;[3] and the name of Maximus was (A.D. 307) proclaimed, by the tumultuary, but unanimous voice, both of the soldiers and of the provincials. The emperor, or the rebel, for his title was not yet ascertained by fortune, was a native of Spain, the countryman, the fellow-soldier, and the rival of Theodosius, whose elevation he had not seen without some emotions of envy and resentment: the events of his life had long since fixed him in Britain; and I should not be unwilling to find some evidence for the marriage, which he is said to have contracted with the daughter of a wealthy lord of Caernarvonshire.[4] But this provincial rank might justly be considered as a state of exile and obscurity; and if Maximus had obtained any civil or military office, he was not invested with the authority either of governor or general.[5] His abilities, and even his integrity, are acknow-

[1] Zos. (l. iv. 247.) and the younger Victor ascribe the revolution to the favour of the Alani, and the discontent of the Roman troops. Dum exercitum negligeret, et paucos ex Alanis, quos ingenti auro ad se transtulerat, anteferret veteri ac Romano militi.

[2] Britannia fertilis provincia tyrannorum, is a memorable expression, used by Jerom in the Pelagian controversy, and variously tortured in the disputes of our national antiquaries. The revolutions of the last age appeared to justify the image of the sublime Bossuet, "cette isle, "plus orageuse que les mers qui l'environnent."

[3] Zosimus says of the British soldiers, *των αλλων απαντων πλεον αυθαδεια και θυμω νικομενους.*

[4] Helena the daughter of Eudda. Her chapel may still be seen at Caer-segont, now Caernarvon (Carte's Hist. of Eng. i. 168. from Rowland's Mona Antiqua). The prudent reader may not perhaps be satisfied with such Welsh evidence.

[5] Cambden (i. Introd. ci.) appoints him governor of Britain; and the father of our antiquities is followed, as usual, by his blind progeny. Pacatus and Zosimus had taken some pains to prevent this error, or fable; and I shall protect myself by their decisive testimonies. Regali habitû *exulem* suum, illi exules orbis induerunt (in Paneg. Vet. xii. 23.), and the Greek

ledged by the partial writers of the age; and the merit must indeed have been conspicuous, that could extort such a confession in favour of the vanquished enemy of Theodosius. The discontent of Maximus might incline him to censure the conduct of his sovereign, and to encourage, perhaps without any views of ambition, the murmurs of the troops. But in the midst of the tumult, he artfully, or modestly, refused to ascend the throne; and some credit appears to have been given to his own positive declaration, that he was compelled to accept the dangerous present of the Imperial purple.[1]

But there was danger likewise in refusing the empire; and from the moment that Maximus had violated his allegiance to his lawful sovereign, he could not hope to reign, or even to live, if he confined his moderate ambition within the narrow limits of Britain. He boldly and wisely resolved to prevent the designs of Gratian; the youth of the island crowded to his standard, and he invaded Gaul with a fleet and army, which were long afterwards remembered, as the emigration of a considerable part of the British nation.[2] The emperor, in his peaceful residence of Paris, was alarmed by their hostile approach; and the darts which he idly wasted on lions and bears, might have been employed more honourably against the rebels. But his feeble efforts announced his degenerate spirit and desperate situation; and deprived him of the resources, which he still might have found, in the support of his subjects and allies. The armies of Gaul, instead of opposing the march of Maximus, received him with joyful and loyal acclamations; and the shame of the desertion was transferred from the people to the prince. The troops, whose station more immediately attached them to the service of the palace, abandoned the standard of Gratian the first time that it was displayed in the neighbourhood of Paris. The emperor of the West fled towards Lyons, with a train of only 300 horse; and, in the cities along the road, where he hoped to find a refuge, or at least a passage, he was taught, by cruel experience, that every gate is shut against the unfortunate. Yet he might still have reached, in safety, the dominions of his brother; and soon have returned with the forces of Italy and the East; if he had not suffered himself to be fatally deceived by the perfidious governor of the Lyonnese province. Gratian was amused by protestations of doubtful fidelity, and the hopes of a support, which could not be effectual; till the arrival of Andragathius, the general of the cavalry of Maximus, put an end to his suspense. That resolute officer executed, without remorse, the orders, or the intentions, of the usurper. Gratian, as he rose from supper, was delivered (A.D. 383. Aug. 25) into the hands of

historian, still less equivocally, *αυτος* (Maximus) *δε ουδε εις αρχην εντιμον ετυχη προελθων* (l. iv. 248.).

[1] Sulpic. Sever. Dialog. ii. 7. Oros. l. vii. c. 34. p. 556. They both acknowledge (Sulpicius had been his subject) his innocence and merit. It is singular enough, that Maximus should be less favourably treated by Zosimus, the partial adversary of his rival.

[2] Abp. Usher (Antiq. Britan. Eccles. p. 107.) has diligently collected the legends of the island, and the continent. The whole emigration consisted of 30,000 soldiers, and 100,000 plebeians, who settled in Bretagne. Their destined brides, St. Ursula with 11,000 noble, and 60,000 plebeian, virgins, mistook their way; landed at Cologne, and were all most cruelly murdered by the Huns. But the plebeian sisters have been defrauded of their equal honours; and, what is still harder, John Trithemius presumes to mention the *children* of these British *virgins.*

the assassin; and his body was denied to the pious and pressing intreaties of his brother Valentinian.[1] The death of the emperor was followed by that of his powerful general Mellobaudes, the king of the Franks; who maintained, to the last moment of his life, the ambiguous reputation, which is the just recompence of obscure and subtle policy.[2] These executions might be necessary to the public safety: but the successful usurper, whose power was acknowledged by all the provinces of the West, had the merit, and the satisfaction, of boasting, that, except those who had perished by the chance of war, his triumph was not stained by the blood of the Romans.[3]

The events of this revolution had passed in such rapid succession, that it would have been impossible for Theodosius to march to the relief of his benefactor, before he received the intelligence of his defeat and death (A.D. 383—387). During the season of sincere grief, or ostentatious mourning, the Eastern emperor was interrupted by the arrival of the principal chamberlain of Maximus: and the choice of a venerable old man, for an office which was usually exercised by eunuchs, announced to the court of Constantinople the gravity and temperance of the British usurper. The ambassador condescended to justify, or excuse, the conduct of his master; and to protest, in specious language, that the murder of Gratian had been perpetrated, without his knowledge or consent, by the precipitate zeal of the soldiers. But he proceeded, in a firm and equal tone, to offer Theodosius the alternative, of peace, or war. The speech of the ambassador concluded with a spirited declaration, that although Maximus, as a Roman, and as the father of his people, would chuse rather to employ his forces in the common defence of the republic, he was armed and prepared, if his friendship should be rejected, to dispute, in a field of battle, the empire of the world. An immediate and peremptory answer was required; but it was extremely difficult for Theodosius to satisfy, on this important occasion, either the feelings of his own mind, or the expectations of the public. The imperious voice of honour and gratitude called aloud for revenge. From the liberality of Gratian, he had received the Imperial diadem: his patience would encourage the odious suspicion, that he was more deeply sensible of former injuries, than of recent obligations; and if he accepted the friendship, he must seem to share the guilt, of the assassin. Even the principles of justice, and the interest of society, would receive a fatal blow from the impunity of Maximus: and the example of successful usurpation would tend to dissolve the artificial fabric of government, and once more replunge the empire in the crimes and calamities of the preceding age. But, as

[1] Zos. (l. iv. 248.) has transported the death of Gratian from Lugdunum in Gaul (Lyons) to Singidunum in Mœsia. Some hints may be extracted from the Chronicles; some lies may be detected in Soz. (l. vii. c. 13.) and Socr. (l. v. c. 11.). Ambrose is our most authentic evidence (i. Enarrat. in Psalm lxi. 961. ii. epist. xxiv. 888, &c. and de Obitû Valentinian. Consolat. No. 28. p. 1182.).

[2] Pacatus (xii. 28.) celebrates his fidelity; while his treachery is marked in Prosper's Chronicle, as the cause of the ruin of Gratian. Ambrose, who has occasion to exculpate himself, only condemns the death of Vallio, a faithful servant of Gratian (ii. epist. xxiv. 891. ed. Benedict.).

[3] He protested, nullum ex adversariis nisi in acie occubuisse. Sulp. Sever. in Vit. B. Martin. c. 23. The orator of Theodosius bestows reluctant, and therefore weighty, praise on his clemency. Si cui ille, pro ceteris sceleribus suis, *minus crudelis* fuisse videtur (Panegyr. Vet. xii. 28.).

the sentiments of gratitude and honour should invariably regulate the conduct of an individual, they may be overbalanced in the mind of a sovereign, by the sense of superior duties : and the maxims both of justice and humanity, must permit the escape of an atrocious criminal, if an innocent people would be involved in the consequences of his punishment. The assassin of Gratian had usurped, but he actually possessed, the most warlike provinces of the empire: the East was exhausted by the misfortunes, and even by the success, of the Gothic war; and it was seriously to be apprehended, that, after the vital strength of the republic had been wasted in a doubtful and destructive contest, the feeble conqueror would remain an easy prey to the Barbarians of the North. These weighty considerations engaged Theodosius to dissemble his resentment, and to accept the alliance of the tyrant. But he stipulated, that Maximus should content himself with the possession of the countries beyond the Alps. The brother of Gratian was confirmed and secured in the sovereignty of Italy, Africa, and the Western Illyricum; and some honourable conditions were inserted in the treaty, to protect the memory, and the laws, of the deceased emperor.[1] According to the custom of the age, the images of the three Imperial colleagues were exhibited to the veneration of the people: nor should it be lightly supposed, that, in the moment of a solemn reconciliation, Theodosius secretly cherished the intention of perfidy and revenge.[2]

The contempt of Gratian for the Roman soldiers, had exposed him to the fatal effects of their resentment. His profound veneration for the Christian clergy was rewarded by the applause and gratitude of a powerful order, which has claimed, in every age, the privilege of dispensing honours, both on earth and in heaven.[3] The orthodox bishops bewailed his death, and their own irreparable loss; but they were soon comforted by the discovery, that Gratian had committed the sceptre of the East to the hands of a prince, whose humble faith, and fervent zeal, were supported by the spirit and abilities of a more vigorous character. Among the benefactors of the church, the fame of Constantine has been rivalled by the glory of Theodosius. If Constantine had the advantage of erecting the standard of the cross, the emulation of his successor assumed the merit of subduing the Arian heresy, and of abolishing the worship of idols in the Roman world. Theodosius was the first of the emperors baptised in the true faith of the Trinity. Although he was born of a Christian family, the maxims, or at least the practice, of the age, encouraged him to delay the ceremony of his initiation; till he was admonished of the danger of delay, by the serious illness which threatened his life, towards the end of the first year of his reign. Before he again took the field against the Goths, he received the sacrament of baptism[4] (A.D. 380. Feb. 28) from Acholius, the orthodox bishop of Thessa-

[1] Ambrose mentions the laws of Gratian, quas non abrogavit hostis (ii. epist. xvii. 827.).

[2] Zos. l. iv. 251. We may disclaim his odious suspicions; but we cannot reject the treaty of peace which the friends of Theodosius have absolutely forgotten, or slightly mentioned.

[3] Their oracle, the archbishop of Milan, assigns to his pupil Gratian an high and respectable place in heaven (ii. de Obit. Val. Consol. p. 1193.).

[4] For the baptism of Theodosius, see Soz. (l. vii. c. 4), Soc. (l. v. c. 6.), and Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 728.).

lonica:[1] and, as the emperor ascended from the holy font, he dictated a solemn edict, which proclaimed his own faith, and prescribed the religion of his subjects. "It is our pleasure (such is the Imperial "style), that all the nations, which are governed by our clemency and "moderation, should steadfastly adhere to the religion which was "taught by St. Peter to the Romans; which faithful tradition has "preserved; and which is now professed by the pontiff Damasus, and "by Peter, bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic holiness. Ac-"cording to the discipline of the apostles, and the doctrine of the "gospel, let us believe the sole deity of the Father, the Son, and the "Holy Ghost; under an equal majesty, and a pious Trinity. We "authorise the followers of this doctrine to assume the title of "Catholic Christians; and as we judge, that all others are extrava-"gant madmen, we brand them with the infamous name of Heretics; "and declare, that their conventicles shall no longer usurp the re-"spectable appellation of churches. Besides the condemnation of "Divine justice, they must expect to suffer the severe penalties, which "our authority, guided by heavenly wisdom, shall think proper to "inflict upon them."[2] The faith of a soldier is commonly the fruit of instruction, rather than of inquiry; but as the emperor always fixed his eyes on the visible land-marks of orthodoxy, which he had so prudently constituted, his religious opinions were never affected by the specious texts, the subtle arguments, and the ambiguous creeds of the Arian doctors. Once indeed he expressed a faint inclination to converse with the eloquent and learned Eunomius, who lived in retirement at a small distance from Constantinople. But the dangerous interview was prevented by the prayers of the Empress Flaccilla, who trembled for the salvation of her husband; and the mind of Theodosius was confirmed by a theological argument, adapted to the rudest capacity. He had lately bestowed, on his eldest son Arcadius, the name and honours of Augustus; and the two princes were seated on a stately throne to receive the homage of their subjects. A bishop, Amphilochius of Iconium, approached the throne, and after saluting, with due reverence, the person of his sovereign, he accosted the royal youth with the same familiar tenderness, which he might have used towards a plebeian child. Provoked by this insolent behaviour, the monarch gave orders, that the rustic priest should be instantly driven from his presence. But while the guards were forcing him to the door, the dexterous polemic had time to execute his design, by exclaiming, with a loud voice, "Such is the treatment, O Emperor! "which the King of Heaven has prepared for those impious men, who "affect to worship the Father, but refuse to acknowledge the equal "majesty of his divine Son." Theodosius immediately embraced the bishop of Iconium; and never forgot the important lesson, which he had received from this dramatic parable.[3]

[1] Ascolius, or Acholius, was honoured by the friendship, and the praises, of Ambrose; who styles him, murus fidei atque sanctitatis (ii. epist. xv. 820.); and afterwards celebrates his speed and diligence in running to Constantinople, Italy, &c. (epist. xvi. 822.) a virtue which does not appertain either to a *wall*, or a *bishop*.

[2] Cod. Theod. l. xvi. tit. i. leg. 2. Godefroy, vi. 5. Such an edict deserved the warmest praises of Baronius, auream sanctionem, edictum pium et salutare.—Sic itur ad astra.

[3] Soz. l. vii. 6. Theodor. l. v. c. 16. Tillemont is displeased (Mem. Eccles. vi. 627.) with

Constantinople was the principal seat and fortress of Arianism; and, in a long interval of forty years[1] (A.D. 340—380), the faith of the princes and prelates, who reigned in the capital of the East, was rejected in the purer schools of Rome and Alexandria. The archiepiscopal throne of Macedonius, which had been polluted with so much Christian blood, was successively filled by Eudoxus and Damophilus. Their diocese enjoyed a free importation of vice and error from every province of the empire; the eager pursuit of religious controversy afforded a new occupation to the busy idleness of the metropolis; and we may credit the assertion of an intelligent observer, who describes, with some pleasantry, the effects of their loquacious zeal. "This city," says he, "is full of mechanics and slaves, who are all of them profound "theologians; and preach in the shops, and in the streets."[2] The heretics, of various denominations, subsisted in peace under the protection of the Arians of Constantinople; who endeavoured to secure the attachment of those obscure sectaries; while they abused, with unrelenting severity, the victory which they had obtained over the followers of the council of Nice. During the partial reigns of Constantius and Valens, the feeble remnant of the Homoousians was deprived of the public and private exercise of their religion; and it has been observed, in pathetic language, that the scattered flock was left without a shepherd to wander on the mountains, or to be devoured by rapacious wolves.[3] But, as their zeal, instead of being subdued, derived strength and vigour from oppression, they seized their first moments of imperfect freedom, which they acquired by the death of Valens, to form themselves into a regular congregation, under the conduct of an episcopal pastor. Two natives of Cappadocia, Basil and Gregory Nazianzen,[4] were distinguished above all their contemporaries,[5] by the rare union of profane eloquence and of orthodox piety. These orators, who might sometimes be compared, by themselves, and by the public, to the most celebrated of the ancient Greeks, were united by the ties of the strictest friendship. They had cultivated, with equal ardour, the same liberal studies in the schools of Athens; they had retired, with equal devotion, to the same solitude in the deserts of Pontus; and every spark of emulation, or envy, appeared to be totally extinguished in the ingenuous breasts of Gregory and Basil. But the exaltation of Basil, from a private life to the archiepiscopal throne of Cæsarea, discovered to the world, and perhaps to himself, the pride of his character; and the first favour which he condescended to bestow

the terms of "rustic bishop," "obscure city." Yet I must take leave to think, that both Amphilochius and Iconium were objects of inconsiderable magnitude in the Roman empire.

[1] Soz. l. vii. c. 5. Socr. l. v. c. 7. Marcellin. in Chron. The account of forty years must be dated from the election or intrusion of Eusebius; who wisely exchanged the bishopric of Nicomedia for the throne of Constantinople.

[2] Jortin on Eccles. Hist. iv. 71. Greg. Naz. Orat. 33. affords indeed some similar ideas.

[3] Greg. Naz. Orat. 32. and account of his own life, which he has composed in 1800 iambics. Yet every physician is prone to exaggerate the inveterate nature of the disease which he has cured.

[4] I confess myself deeply indebted to the *two* Lives of Greg. Nazianzen, composed, with very different views, by Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. ix. 305, 692.), and Le Clerc (Biblio. Univ. xviii. p. 1—128.).

[5] Unless Greg. Nazianzen mistook 30 years in his own age, he was born, as well as his friend Basil, about the year 329. The preposterous chronology of Suidas has been graciously received; because it removes the scandal of Gregory's father begetting children after he became a bishop (Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. ix. 693.).

on his friend was received, and perhaps was intended, as a cruel insult.[1] Instead of employing the superior talents of Gregory in some useful and conspicuous station, the haughty prelate selected, among the fifty bishoprics of his extensive province, the wretched village of Sasima,[2] without water, without verdure, without society, situate at the junction of three highways, and frequented only by the incessant passage of rude and clamorous waggoners. Gregory submitted with reluctance to this humiliating exile: he was ordained bishop of Sasima; but he solemnly protests, that he never consummated his spiritual marriage with this disgusting bride. He afterwards consented to undertake the government of his native church of Nazianzus,[3] of which his father had been bishop above five-and-forty years. But as he was still conscious, that he deserved another audience, and another theatre, he accepted, with no unworthy ambition, the honourable invitation, which was addressed to him from the orthodox party of Constantinople. On his arrival (A.D. 378. Nov.) in the capital, Gregory was entertained in the house of a pious and charitable kinsman; the most spacious room was consecrated to the uses of religious worship; and the name of *Anastasia* was chosen, to express the resurrection of the Nicene faith. This private conventicle was afterwards converted into a magnificent church; and the credulity of the succeeding age was prepared to believe the miracles and visions, which attested the presence, or at least the protection, of the Mother of God.[4] The pulpit of the Anastasia was the scene of the labours and triumphs of Gregory Nazianzen; and, in the space of two years, he experienced all the spiritual adventures which constitute the prosperous or adverse fortunes of a missionary.[5] The Arians, who were provoked by the boldness of his enterprise, represented his doctrine, as if he had preached three distinct and equal Deities; and the devout populace was excited to suppress, by violence and tumult, the irregular assemblies of the Athanasian heretics. From the cathedral of St. Sophia, there issued a motley crowd "of common beggars, who had forfeited

[1] Gregory's Poem on his own Life contains some beautiful lines (ii. 8.), which burst from the heart, and speak the pangs of injured and lost friendship:

. . . . πονοι κοινοι λογων,
Ομοστεγος τε και συνεστιος βιος,
Νους εις εν αμφοιν . . . . . .
Διεσκεδασται παντα, ερριπται χαμαι,
Αυραι φερουσι τας παλαιας ελπιδας.

In the Midsummer Night's Dream, Helena addresses the same pathetic complaint to her friend Hermia:

Is all the counsel that we two have shared, The sister's vows, &c.

Shakespeare had never read the poems of Gregory Nazianzen: he was ignorant of the Greek language; but his mother-tongue, the language of Nature, is the same in Cappadocia and in Britain.

[2] This unfavourable portrait of Sasima is drawn by Greg. Naz. (ii. de Vitâ suâ, p. 7, 8.) Its precise situation, 49 miles, from Archilais, and 32 from Tyana, is fixed in the Itinerary of Antoninus (p. 144. ed. Wessel.).

[3] The name of Nazianzus has been immortalized by Gregory; but his native town, under the Greek or Roman title of Diocæsarea (Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. ix. 692.), is mentioned by Pliny (vi. 3.), Ptolemy, and Hierocles (Itinerar. Wessel. p. 709.). It appears to have been situate on the edge of Isauria.

[4] Ducange, Constant. Christiana, l. iv. 141. The θεια δυναμις of Soz. (l. vii. c. 5.) is interpreted to mean the Virgin Mary.

[5] Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. ix. 432.) diligently collects, enlarges, and explains, the oratorical and poetical hints of Gregory himself.

"their claim to pity; of monks, who had the appearance of goats or "satyrs; and of women, more terrible than so many Jezebels." The doors of the Anastasia were broke open; much mischief was perpetrated, or attempted, with sticks, stones. and firebrands; and as a man lost his life in the affray, Gregory, who was summoned the next morning before the magistrate, had the satisfaction of supposing, that he publicly confessed the name of Christ. After he was delivered from the fear and danger of a foreign enemy, his infant church was disgraced and distracted by intestine faction. A stranger, who assumed the name of Maximus,[1] and the cloak of a Cynic philospher, insinuated himself into the confidence of Gregory; deceived and abused his favourable opinion; and forming a secret connection with some bishops of Egypt, attempted, by a clandestine ordination, to supplant his patron in the episcopal seat of Constantinople. These mortifications might sometimes tempt the Cappadocian missionary to regret his obscure solitude. But his fatigues were rewarded by the daily increase of his fame and his congregation; and he enjoyed the pleasure of observing, that the greater part of his numerous audience retired from his sermons, satisfied with the eloquence of the preacher,[2] or dissatisfied with the manifold imperfections of their faith and practice.[3]

The Catholics of Constantinople were animated with joyful confidence by the baptism and edict of Theodosius; and they impatiently waited the effects of his gracious promise. Their hopes were speedily accomplished; and the emperor, as soon as he had finished the operations of the campaign, made (A.D. 380. Nov. 26) his public entry into the capital at the head of a victorious army. The next day after his arrival, he summoned Damophilus to his presence; and offered that Arian prelate the hard alternative of subscribing the Nicene creed, or of instantly resigning, to the orthodox believers, the use and possession of the episcopal palace, the cathedral of St. Sophia, and all the churches of Constantinople. The zeal of Damophilus, which in a Catholic saint would have been justly applauded, embraced, without hesitation, a life of poverty and exile;[4] and his removal was immediately followed by the purification of the Imperial city. The Arians might complain, with some appearance of justice, that an inconsiderable congregation of sectaries should usurp the hundred churches, which they were insufficient to fill: whilst the far greater part of the people was cruelly excluded from every place of religious worship. Theodosius was still inexorable: but as the angels who protected the Catholic cause, were only visible to the eyes of faith, he prudently reinforced those heavenly legions, with the more effectual aid of temporal

[1] He pronounced an oration (i. Orat. xxiii. 409.) in his praise; but after their quarrel, the name of Maximus was changed into that of Heron (Jerom, i. in Catalog. Script. Eccles. p. 301.). I touch slightly on these obscure and personal squabbles.

[2] Under the modest emblem of a dream, Greg. (ii. carmen ix. 78.) describes his own success with some human complacency. Yet it should seem, from his familiar conversation with his auditor St. Jerom (i. Epist. ad Nepotian. p. 14.), that the preacher understood the true value of popular applause.

[3] Lachrymæ auditorum laudes tuæ sint. is the lively and judicious advice of St. Jerom.

[4] Socr. (l. v. c. 7.) and Soz. (l. vii. c. 5.) relate the evangelical words and actions of Damophilus without a word of approbation. He considered, says Socrates, that it is difficult to *resist* the powerful: but it was easy, and would have been profitable, to *submit*.

and carnal weapons: and the church of St. Sophia was occupied by a large body of the Imperial guards. If the mind of Gregory was susceptible of pride, he must have felt a very lively satisfaction, when the emperor conducted him through the streets in solemn triumph; and, with his own hand, respectfully placed him on the archiepiscopal throne of Constantinople. But the saint (who had not subdued the imperfections of human virtue) was deeply affected by the mortifying consideration, that his entrance into the fold was that of a wolf, rather than of a shepherd: that the glittering arms, which surrounded his person, were necessary for his safety; and that he alone was the object of the imprecations of a great party, whom, as men and citizens, it was impossible for him to despise. He beheld the innumerable multitude of either sex, and of every age, who crowded the streets, the windows, and the roofs of the houses; he heard the tumultuous voice of rage, grief, astonishment, and despair; and Gregory fairly confesses, that on the memorable day of his installation, the capital of the East wore the appearance of a city taken by storm, and in the hands of a Barbarian conqueror.[1] About six weeks afterwards, Theodosius declared his resolution of expelling from all the churches of his dominions, the bishops and their clergy, who should obstinately refuse to believe, or at least to profess, the doctrine of the council of Nice. His lieutenant Sapor was (A.D. 381. Jan. 10) armed with the ample powers of a general law, a special commission, and a military force;[2] and this ecclesiastical revolution was conducted with so much discretion and vigour, that the religion of the emperor was established, without tumult, or bloodshed, in all the provinces of the East. The writings of the Arians, if they had been permitted to exist,[3] would perhaps contain the lamentable story of the persecution, which afflicted the church under the reign of the impious Theodosius; and the sufferings of *their* holy confessors, might claim the pity of the disinterested reader. Yet there is reason to imagine that the violence of zeal and revenge was, in some measure, eluded by the want of resistance; and that, in their adversity, the Arians displayed much less firmness, than had been exerted by the orthodox party under the reigns of Constantius and Valens. The moral character and conduct of the hostile sects appear to have been governed by the same common principles of nature and religion: but a very material circumstance may be discovered, which tended to distinguish the degrees of their theological faith. Both parties, in the schools, as well as in the temples, acknowledged and worshipped the divine majesty of Christ; and as we are always prone to impute our own sentiments and passions to the Deity, it would be deemed more prudent and respectful to exaggerate, than to circumscribe, the adorable perfections of the Son of God. The disciple of Athanasius exulted in the proud confidence, that he had entitled him-

[1] Greg. Naz. ii. de Vitâ suâ, p. 21. For the sake of posterity, the bishop of Constantinople records a stupendous prodigy. In the month of November, it was a cloudy morning; but the sun broke forth, when the procession entered the church.

[2] Of the three ecclesiastical historians, Theodor. alone (l. v. c. 2.) has mentioned this important commission of Sapor, which Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 728.) judiciously removes from the reign of Gratian to that of Theodosius.

[3] I do not reckon Philostorgius, though he mentions (l. ix. c. 19.) the expulsion of Damophilus. The Eunomian historian has been carefully strained through an orthodox sieve.

self to the divine favour: while the follower of Arius must have been tormented by the secret apprehension, that he was guilty, perhaps, of an unpardonable offence, by the scanty praise, and parsimonious honours, which he bestowed on the Judge of the World. The opinions of Arianism might satisfy a cold and speculative mind; but the doctrine of the Nicene Creed, most powerfully recommended by the merits of faith and devotion, was much better adapted to become popular and successful in a believing age.

The hope that truth and wisdom would be found in the assemblies of the orthodox clergy, induced the emperor to convene (A.D. 381. May), at Constantinople, a synod of 150 bishops, who proceeded, without much difficulty or delay, to complete the theological system which had been established in the council of Nice. The vehement disputes of the fourth century had been chiefly employed on the nature of the Son of God: and the various opinions, which were embraced concerning the *Second*, were extended and transferred, by a natural analogy, to the *Third*, person of the Trinity.[1] Yet it was found, or it was thought, necessary, by the victorious adversaries of Arianism, to explain the ambiguous language of some respectable doctors; to confirm the faith of the Catholics; and to condemn an unpopular and inconsistent sect of Macedonians; who freely admitted that the Son was consubstantial to the Father, while they were fearful of seeming to acknowledge the existence of *Three* Gods. A final and unanimous sentence was pronounced to ratify the equal Deity of the Holy Ghost; the mysterious doctrine has been received by all the nations, and all the churches of the Christian world; and their grateful reverence has assigned to the bishops of Theodosius, the second rank among the general councils.[2] Their knowledge of religious truth may have been preserved by tradition, or it may have been communicated by inspiration; but the sober evidence of history will not allow much weight to the personal authority of the Fathers of Constantinople. In an age, when the ecclesiastics had scandalously degenerated from the model of apostolical purity, the most worthless and corrupt were always the most eager to frequent, and disturb, the episcopal assemblies. The conflict and fermentation of so many opposite interests and tempers inflamed the passions of the bishops: and their ruling passions were the love of gold, and the love of dispute. Many of the same prelates who now applauded the orthodox piety of Theodosius, had repeatedly changed, with prudent flexibility, their creeds and opinions; and in the various revolutions of the church and state, the religion of their sovereign was the rule of their obsequious faith. When the emperor suspended his prevailing influence, the turbulent synod was blindly impelled, by the absurd or selfish motives of pride, hatred, and resentment. The death of Meletius, which happened at the council of Constantinople, presented the most favourable opportunity of termin-

[1] Le Clerc has given a curious extract (Biblio. Univ. xviii. 91.) of the theological sermons which Gregory Nazianzen pronounced at Constantinople against the Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians, &c. He tells the Macedonians, who deified the Father and the Son, without the Holy Ghost, that they might as well be styled *Tritheists*, as *Ditheists*. Gregory himself was almost a Tritheist; and his monarchy of heaven resembles a well-regulated aristocracy.

[2] The first general council of Constantinople now triumphs in the Vatican: but the popes had long hesitated, and their hesitation perplexes, and almost staggers, the humble Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. ix. 499.).

ating the schism of Antioch, by suffering his aged rival, Paulinus, peaceably to end his days in the episcopal chair. The faith and virtues of Paulinus were unblemished. But his cause was supported by the Western churches: and the bishops of the synod resolved to perpetuate the mischiefs of discord, by the hasty ordination of a perjured candidate,[1] rather than to betray the imagined dignity of the East, which had been illustrated by the birth and death of the Son of God. Such unjust and disorderly proceedings forced the gravest members of the assembly to dissent and to secede; and the clamorous majority, which remained masters of the field of battle, could be compared only to wasps or magpies, to a flight of cranes, or to a flock of geese.[2]

A suspicion may possibly arise, that so unfavourable a picture of ecclesiastical synods has been drawn by the partial hand of some obstinate heretic, or some malicious infidel. But the name of the sincere historian who has conveyed (A.D. 381) this instructive lesson to the knowledge of posterity, must silence the impotent murmurs of superstition and bigotry. He was one of the most pious and eloquent bishops of the age; a saint and a doctor of the church; the scourge of Arianism, and the pillar of the orthodox faith; a distinguished member of the council of Constantinople, in which, after the death of Meletius, he exercised the functions of president: in a word—Gregory Nazianzen himself. The harsh and ungenerous treatment which he experienced,[3] instead of derogating from the truth of his evidence, affords an additional proof of the spirit which actuated the deliberations of the synod. Their unanimous suffrage had confirmed the pretensions which the bishop of Constantinople derived from the choice of the people, and the approbation of the emperor. But Gregory soon became the victim of malice and envy. The bishops of the East, his strenuous adherents, provoked by his moderation in the affairs of Antioch, abandoned him, without support, to the adverse faction of the Egyptians; who disputed the validity of his election, and rigorously asserted the obsolete canon, that prohibited the licentious practice of episcopal translations. The pride, or the humility, of Gregory prompted him to decline a contest which might have been imputed to ambition and avarice; and he publicly offered, not without some mixture of indignation, to renounce the government of a church, which had been restored, and almost created, by his labours. His resignation was accepted by the synod, and by the emperor, with more readiness than he seems to have expected. At the time when he might have hoped to enjoy the fruits of his victory, his episcopal throne was filled by the senator Nectarius; and the new archbishop, accidentally recommended

[1] Before the death of Meletius, six or eight of his most popular ecclesiastics, among whom was Flavian, had *abjured*, for the sake of peace, the bishopric of Antioch (Soz. l. vii. c. 3. 11. Socr. l. v. c. 5.). Tillemont thinks it his duty to disbelieve the story; but he owns that there are many circumstances in the life of Flavian, which *seem* inconsistent with the praises of Chrysostom, and the character of a saint (Mem. Eccles. x. 541.).

[2] Greg. Naz. de Vitâ suâ, ii. 25.). His general and particular opinion of the clergy and their assemblies, may be seen in verse and prose (i. orat. i. 33. epist. lv. 814. ii. carmen x. 81.). Such passages are faintly marked by Tillemont, and fairly produced by Le Clerc.

[3] Greg. ii. de Vitâ suâ, 28. Orations 14. 27. 32. were pronounced in the several stages of this business. The peroration of the last (i. 528.), in which he takes a solemn leave of men and angels, the city and the emperor, the East and the West, &c. is pathetic, and almost sublime.

by his easy temper and venerable aspect, was obliged to delay the ceremony of his consecration, till he had previously dispatched the rites of his baptism.[1] After this remarkable experience of the ingratitude of princes and prelates, Gregory retired once more to his obscure solitude of Cappadocia; where he employed the remainder of his life, about eight years, in the exercises of poetry and devotion. The title of Saint has been added to his name; but the tenderness of his heart,[2] and the elegance of his genius, reflect a more pleasing lustre on the memory of Gregory Nazianzen.

It was not enough that Theodosius had suppressed the insolent reign of Arianism, or that he had abundantly revenged the injuries which the Catholics sustained from the zeal of Constantius and Valens. The orthodox emperor considered every heretic as a rebel against the supreme powers of heaven, and of earth; and each of those powers might exercise their peculiar jurisdiction over the soul and body of the guilty. The decrees of the council of Constantinople had ascertained the true standard of the faith; and the ecclesiastics, who governed the conscience of Theodosius, suggested the most effectual methods of persecution. In the space of fifteen years (A.D. 380—394), he promulgated at least fifteen severe edicts against the heretics;[3] more especially against those who rejected the doctrine of the Trinity; and to deprive them of every hope of escape, he sternly enacted, that if any laws, or rescripts, should be alleged in their favour, the judges should consider them as the illegal productions either of fraud, or forgery. The penal statutes were directed against the ministers, the assemblies, and the persons, of the heretics; and the passions of the legislator were expressed in the language of declamation, and invective. I. The heretical teachers, who usurped the sacred titles of Bishops, or Presbyters, were not only excluded from the privileges and emoluments so liberally granted to the orthodox clergy, but they were exposed to the heavy penalties of exile and confiscation, if they presumed to preach the doctrine, or to practise the rites, of their *accursed* sects. A fine of ten pounds of gold (above £400) was imposed on every person who should dare to confer, or receive, or promote, an heretical ordination: and it was reasonably expected, that if the race of pastors could be extinguished, their helpless flocks would be compelled, by ignorance and hunger, to return within the pale of the Catholic church. II. The rigorous prohibition of Conventicles was carefully extended to every possible circumstance, in which the heretics could assemble with the intention of worshipping God and Christ according to the dictates of their conscience. Their religious meetings, whether public or secret, by day or by night, in cities or in the country, were equally proscribed by the edicts of Theodosius; and the building, or ground, which had been used for that illegal purpose, was forfeited to the Imperial domain.

[1] The whimsical ordination of Nectarius is attested by Sozomen (l. vii. c. 8.); but Tillemont observes (Mem. Eccles. ix. 719.), Après tout, ce narré de Sozomene est si honteaux pour tous ceux qu'il y mele, et sourtout pour Theodose, qu'il vaut mieux travailler à le detruire, qu'à le soutenir; an admirable canon of criticism!

[2] I can only be understood to mean, that such was his natural temper, when it was not hardened, or inflamed, by religious zeal. From his retirement he exhorts Nectarius to prosecute the heretics of Constantinople.

[3] Theod. Code, l. xvi. tit. v. leg. 6., also Godefroy, and his general summary, or *Paratitlon*, vi. 104

III. It was supposed, that the error of the heretics could proceed only from the obstinate temper of their minds ; and that such a temper was a fit object of censure and punishment. The anathemas of the church were fortified by a sort of civil excommunication, which separated them from their fellow-citizens, by a peculiar brand of infamy; and this declaration of the supreme magistrate tended to justify, or at least to excuse, the insults of a fanatic populace. The sectaries were gradually disqualified for the possession of honourable, or lucrative, employments ; and Theodosius was satisfied with his own justice, when he decreed, that as the Eunomians distinguished the nature of the Son from that of the Father, they should be incapable of making their wills, or of receiving any advantage from testamentary donations. The guilt of the Manichæan heresy was esteemed of such magnitude, that it could be expiated only by the death of the offender ; and the same capital punishment was inflicted on the Audians, or *Quartodecimans*,[1] who should dare to perpetrate the atrocious crime, of celebrating, on an improper day, the festival of Easter. Every Roman might exercise the right of public accusation ; but the office of *Inquisitors* of the Faith, a name so deservedly abhorred, was first instituted under the reign of Theodosius. Yet we are assured that the execution of his penal edicts was seldom enforced ; and that the pious emperor appeared less desirous to punish, than to reclaim, or terrify, his refractory subjects.—*Sozomen*, l. vii. c. 12.

The theory of persecution was established by Theodosius, whose justice and piety have been applauded by the saints ; but the practice of it, in the fullest extent, was (A.D. 385) reserved for his rival and colleague Maximus, the first, among the Christian princes, who shed the blood of his Christian subjects, on account of their religious opinions. The cause of the Priscillianists,[2] a recent sect of heretics, who disturbed the provinces of Spain, was transferred, by appeal, from the synod of Bourdeaux to the Imperial consistory of Treves ; and by the sentence of the Prætorian præfect, seven persons were tortured, condemned, and executed. The first of these was Priscillian[3] himself, bishop of Avila,[4] in Spain ; who adorned the advantages of birth and fortune, by the accomplishments of eloquence and learning. Two presbyters, and two deacons, accompanied their beloved master in his death, which they esteemed as a glorious martyrdom ; and the number of religious victims was completed by the execution of Latronian, a poet, who rivalled the fame of the ancients ; and of Euchrocia, a noble

[1] They always kept their Easter, like the Jewish Passover, on the fourteenth day of the first moon after the vernal equinox ; and thus pertinaciously opposed the Roman church and Nicene Synod, which had *fixed* Easter to a Sunday. Bingham's Antiq. l. xx. c. 5. ii. 309. fol. ed.

[2] Sacred Hist. of Sulpic. Sever. (l. ii. 437. ed. Lugd. Bat. 1647.), a correct and original writer. Lardner (Credibil. &c. part ii. ix. 256.) has laboured this article, with pure learning, good sense, and moderation. Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. viii. 491.) has raked together all the dirt of the fathers ; an useful scavenger !

[3] Sever. Sulpic. mentions the arch-heretic with esteem and pity. Fælix profecto, si non pravo studio corrumpisset optimum ingenium : prorsus multa in eo animi et corporis bona cerneres (Hist. Sacra, l. ii. 439.). Even Jerom (i. in Script. Eccles. p. 302.) speaks with temper of Priscillian and Latronian.

[4] The bishopric (in Old Castile) is now worth 20,000 ducats a year (Busching's Geog. ii. 308.), and is therefore much less likely to produce the author of a new heresy.

matron of Bourdeaux, the widow of the orator Delphidius.[1] Two bishops, who had embraced the sentiments of Priscillian, were condemned to a distant and dreary exile;[2] and some indulgence was shown to the meaner criminals, who assumed the merit of an early repentance. If any credit could be allowed to confessions extorted by fear or pain, and to vague reports, the offspring of malice and credulity, the heresy of the Priscillianists would be found to include the various abominations of magic, of impiety, and of lewdness.[3] An accurate, or rather a candid, enquiry, will discover, that if the Priscillianists violated the laws of nature, it was not by the licentiousness, but by the austerity of their lives. They absolutely condemned the use of th marriage-bed; and the peace of families was often disturbed by indiscreet separations. They enjoined, or recommended, a total abstinence from all animal food; and their continual prayers, fasts, and vigils, inculcated a rule of strict and perfect devotion. The speculative tenets of the sect, concerning the person of Christ, and the nature of the human soul, were derived from the Gnostic and Manichæan system; and this vain philosophy, which had been transported from Egypt to Spain, was ill adapted to the grosser spirits of the West. The obscure disciples of Priscillian suffered, languished, and gradually disappeared: his tenets were rejected by the clergy and people, but his death was the subject of a long and vehement controversy; while some arraigned, and others applauded, the justice of his sentence. It is with pleasure that we can observe the humane inconsistency of the most illustrious saints and bishops, Ambrose of Milan (*Ambros.* ii. epist. xxiv. 891.) and Martin of Tours;[4] who, on this occasion, asserted the cause of toleration. They pitied the unhappy men, who had been executed at Treves; they refused to hold communion with their episcopal murderers; and if Martin deviated from that generous resolution, his motives were laudable, and his repentance was exemplary. The bishops of Tours and Milan pronounced, without hesitation, the eternal damnation of heretics; but they were surprised, and shocked, by the bloody image of their temporal death, and the honest feelings of nature resisted the artificial prejudices of theology. The humanity of Ambrose and Martin was confirmed by the scandalous irregularity of the proceedings against Priscillian and his adherents. The civil and ecclesiastical ministers had transgressed the limits of their respective provinces. The secular judge had presumed to receive an appeal, and to pronounce a definitive sentence, in a matter of faith, and episcopal jurisdiction. The bishops had disgraced themselves, by exercising the function of accusers in a criminal prosecution. The cruelty of Itha-

[1] Exprobabatur mulieri viduæ nimia religio, et diligentius culta divinitas (Pacat. in Paneg. Vet. xii. 29.). Such was the idea of a humane, though ignorant, polytheist.

[2] One of them was sent in Syllinam insulam quæ ultra Britanniam est. What must have been the ancient condition of the rocks of Scilly (Cambden's Britannia, ii. 1519.)?

[3] The scandalous calumnies of Augustin, Pope Leo, &c. which Tillemont swallows like a child, and Lardner refutes like a man, may suggest some candid suspicions in favour of the older Gnostics.

[4] In the Sacred History, and the Life of St. Martin, Sulpicius Severus uses some caution; but he declares himself more freely in the Dialogues (iii. 15.). Martin was reproved, however, by his own conscience, and by an angel; nor could he afterwards perform miracles with so much ease.

cius,[1] who beheld the tortures, and solicited the death, of the heretics, provoked the just indignation of mankind; and the vices of that profligate bishop were admitted as a proof, that his zeal was instigated by the sordid motives of interest. Since the death of Priscillian, the rude attempts of persecution have been refined and methodized in the holy office, which assigns their distinct parts to the ecclesiastical and secular powers. The devoted victim is regularly delivered by the priest to the magistrate, and by the magistrate to the executioner; and the inexorable sentence of the church, which declares the spiritual guilt of the offender, is expressed in the mild language of pity and intercession.

Among the ecclesiastics, who (A.D. 374—397) illustrated the reign of Theodosius, Gregory Nazianzen was distinguished by the talents of an eloquent preacher; the reputation of miraculous gifts, added weight and dignity to the monastic virtues of Martin of Tours;[2] but the palm of episcopal vigour and ability was justly claimed by the intrepid Ambrose.[3] He was descended from a noble family of Romans; his father had exercised the important office of Prætorian præfect of Gaul; and the son, after passing through the studies of a liberal education, attained, in the regular gradation of civil honours, the station of consular of Liguria, a province which included the Imperial residence of Milan. At the age of thirty-four, and before he had received the sacrament of baptism, Ambrose, to his own surprise, and to that of the world, was suddenly transformed from a governor to an archbishop. Without the least mixture, as it is said, of art or intrigue, the whole body of the people unanimously saluted him with the episcopal title; the concord and perseverance of their acclamations were ascribed to a præternatural impulse; and the reluctant magistrate was compelled to undertake a spiritual office, for which he was not prepared by the habits and occupations of his former life. But the active force of his genius soon qualified him to exercise, with zeal and prudence, the duties of his ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and, while he cheerfully renounced the vain and splendid trappings of temporal greatness, he condescended, for the good of the church, to direct the conscience of the emperors, and to control the administration of the empire. Gratian loved and revered him as a father; and the elaborate treatise on the faith of the Trinity, was designed for the instruction of the young prince. After his tragic death, at a time when the empress Justina trembled for her own safety, and for that of her son Valentinian, the archbishop of Milan was dispatched on two different embassies, to the court of Treves. He exercised, with equal firmness and dexterity, the powers of his spiritual and political characters; and perhaps contributed, by his authority and eloquence, to check the ambition of Maximus, and to protect the peace of Italy.[4] Ambrose had

[1] The Catholic presbyter (Sulp. Sever. l. ii. 448.), and the pagan Orator (Pacat. in Paneg. Vet. xii. 29.), reprobate, with equal indignation, the character and conduct of Ithacius.

[2] The Life of St. Martin, and the Dialogues concerning his miracles, contain facts adapted to the grossest barbarism, in a style not unworthy of the Augustan age. So natural is the alliance between good taste and good sense, that I am always astonished by this contrast.

[3] The short and superficial Life of St. Ambrose, by his deacon Paulinus (Append. ad ed. Benedict. p. i—xv.), has the merit of original evidence. Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. x. 78.), and the Benedictine editors (p. xxxi—lxiii.), have laboured with their usual diligence.

[4] Ambrose himself (iii. epist. xxiv. 888.) gives the emperor a very spirited account of his own embassy.

devoted his life, and his abilities, to the service of the church. Wealth was the object of his contempt; he had renounced his private patrimony; and he sold, without hesitation, the consecrated plate, for the redemption of captives. The clergy and people of Milan were attached to their archbishop; and he deserved the esteem, without soliciting the favour, or apprehending the displeasure, of his feeble sovereigns.

The government of Italy, and of the young emperor, naturally devolved to his mother Justina, a woman of beauty and spirit, but who, in the midst of an orthodox people, had the misfortune of professing the Arian heresy, which she endeavoured to instil into the mind of her son. Justina was persuaded, that a Roman emperor might claim, in his own dominions, the public exercise of his religion; and she proposed to the archbishop, as a moderate and reasonable concession, that he should resign the use of a single church, either in the city or suburbs of Milan. But the conduct of Ambrose was governed by very different principles.[1] The palaces of the earth might indeed belong to Cæsar; but the churches were the houses of God; and, within the limits of his diocese, he himself, as the lawful successor of the apostles, was the only minister of God. The privileges of Christianity, temporal as well as spiritual, were confined to the true believers; and the mind of Ambrose was satisfied, that his own theological opinions were the standard of truth and orthodoxy. The archbishop, who refused to hold any conference, or negociation, with the instruments of Satan, declared, with modest firmness, his resolution to die a martyr, rather than to yield to the impious sacrilege; and Justina, who resented the refusal as an act of insolence and rebellion, hastily determined to exert the Imperial prerogative of her son. As she desired to perform her public devotions on the approaching festival of Easter, Ambrose was ordered to appear before the council. He obeyed the summons with the respect of a faithful subject, but he was followed, without his consent, by an innumerable people: they pressed, with impetuous zeal, against the gates of the palace; and the affrighted ministers of Valentinian, instead of pronouncing a sentence of exile on the archbishop of Milan, humbly requested that he would interpose his authority, to protect the person of the emperor, and to restore the tranquillity of the capital. But the promises which Ambrose received and communicated, were soon violated by a perfidious court; and, during six (A.D. 385. April 3—10) of the most solemn days, which Christian piety has set apart for the exercise of religion, the city was agitated by the irregular convulsions of tumult and fanaticism. The officers of the household were directed to prepare, first, the Portian, and afterwards, the new, *Basilica*, for the immediate reception of the emperor, and his mother. The splendid canopy and hangings of the royal seat were arranged in the customary manner; but it was found necessary to defend them, by a strong guard, from the insults of the populace. The Arian ecclesiastics, who ventured to show themselves in the streets, were exposed to the most imminent danger of their lives: and Ambrose enjoyed the merit and

[1] His own representation of his principles and conduct (ii. epist. xx, xxi, xxii.) is one of the curious monuments of ecclesiastical antiquity. It contains two letters to his sister Marcellina, with a petition to Valentinian, and the sermon *de Basilicis non tradendis.*

reputation of rescuing his personal enemies from the hands of the enraged multitude.

But while he laboured to restrain the effects of their zeal, the pathetic vehemence of his sermons continually inflamed the angry and seditious temper of the people of Milan. The characters of Eve, of the wife of Job, of Jezebel, of Herodias, were indecently applied to the mother of the emperor; and her desire to obtain a church for the Arians, was compared to the most cruel persecutions which Christianity had endured under the reign of Paganism. The measures of the court served only to expose the magnitude of the evil. A fine of two hundred pounds of gold was imposed on the corporate body of merchants and manufacturers: an order was signified, in the name of the emperor, to all the officers, and inferior servants, of the courts of justice, that, during the continuance of the public disorders, they should strictly confine themselves to their houses: and the ministers of Valentinian imprudently confessed, that the most respectable part of the citizens of Milan was attached to the cause of their archbishop. He was again solicited to restore peace to his country, by a timely compliance with the will of his sovereign. The reply of Ambrose was couched in the most humble and respectful terms, which might, however, be interpreted as a serious declaration of civil war. "His "life and fortune were in the hands of the emperor; but he would "never betray the church of Christ, or degrade the dignity of the "episcopal character. In such a cause, he was prepared to suffer "whatever the malice of the dæmon could inflict; and he only wished "to die in the presence of his faithful flock, and at the foot of the "altar; *he* had not contributed to excite, but it was in the power of "God alone to appease, the rage of the people: he deprecated the "scenes of blood and confusion, which were likely to ensue; and it "was his fervent prayer, that he might not survive to behold the ruin "of a flourishing city, and perhaps the desolation of all Italy."[1] The obstinate bigotry of Justina would have endangered the empire of her son, if, in this contest with the church and people of Milan, she could have depended on the active obedience of the troops of the palace. A large body of Goths had marched to occupy the *Basilica*, which was the object of the dispute: and it might be expected from the Arian principles, and barbarous manners, of these foreign mercenaries, that they would not entertain any scruples in the execution of the most sanguinary orders. They were encountered, on the sacred threshold, by the archbishop, who, thundering against them a sentence of excommunication, asked them, in the tone of a father and a master, Whether it was to invade the house of God, that they had implored the hospitable protection of the republic? The suspense of the Barbarians allowed some hours for a more effectual negociation; and the empress was persuaded, by the advice of her wisest counsellors, to leave the Catholics in possession of all the churches of Milan; and to dissemble, till a more convenient season, her intentions of revenge.

[1] Retz had a similar message from the queen, to request that he would appease the tumult of Paris. It was no longer in his power, &c. A quoi j'ajoutai tout ce que vous pouvez vous imaginer de respect, de douleur, de regret, et de soumission, &c. (Memoires, i. 140.) Certainly I do not compare either the causes or the men; yet the coadjutor himself had some idea (p. 84.) of imitating St. Ambrose.

The mother of Valentinian could never forgive the triumph of Ambrose; and the royal youth uttered a passionate exclamation, that his own servants were ready to betray him into the hands of an insolent priest.

The laws of the empire, some of which were inscribed with the name of Valentinian, still (A.D. 386) condemned the Arian heresy, and seemed to excuse the resistance of the Catholics. By the influence of Justin, an edict of toleration was promulgated in all the provinces which were subject to the court of Milan; the free exercise of their religion was granted to those who professed the faith of Rimini; and the emperor declared, that all persons who should infringe this sacred and salutary constitution, should be capitally punished, as the enemies of the public peace.[1] The character and language of the archbishop of Milan may justify the suspicion, that his conduct soon afforded a reasonable ground, or at least a specious pretence, to the Arian ministers; who watched the opportunity of surprising him in some act of disobedience to a law, which he strangely represents as a law of blood and tyranny. A sentence of easy and honourable banishment was pronounced, which enjoined Ambrose to depart from Milan without delay; whilst it permitted him to choose the place of his exile, and the number of his companions. But the authority of the saints, who have preached and practised the maxims of passive loyalty, appeared to Ambrose of less moment than the extreme and pressing danger of the church. He boldly refused to obey; and his refusal was supported by the unanimous consent of his faithful people.[2] They guarded by turns the person of their archbishop; the gates of the cathedral and the episcopal palace were strongly secured; and the Imperial troops, who had formed the blockade, were unwilling to risk the attack, of that impregnable fortress. The numerous poor, who had been relieved by the liberality of Ambrose, embraced the fair occasion of signalizing their zeal and gratitude; and as the patience of the multitude might have been exhausted by the length and uniformity of nocturnal vigils, he prudently introduced into the church of Milan the useful institution of a loud and regular psalmody. While he maintained this arduous contest, he was instructed, by a dream, to open the earth in a place where the remains of two martyrs, Gervasius and Protasius,[3] had been deposited above three hundred years. Immediately under the pavement of the church two perfect skeletons were found,[4] with the heads separated from their bodies, and a plentiful effusion of blood. The holy relics were presented, in solemn pomp, to the veneration of the people; and every circumstance of this fortunate discovery was admirably adapted to

[1] Sozomen alone (l. vii. c. 13.) throws this luminous fact into a dark and perplexed narrative.

[2] Excubabat pia plebs in ecclesiâ mori parata cum episcopo suo . . . . Nos adhuc frigidi excitabamur tamen civitate attonitâ atque turbatâ. Aug. Confess. l. ix. c. 7.

[3] Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. ii. 78. 498. Many churches in Italy, Gaul, &c. were dedicated to these unknown martyrs, of whom St. Gervase seems to have been more fortunate than his companion.

[4] Invenimus miræ magnitudinis viros duos, ut prisca ætas ferebat. ii. epist. xxii. 875. The size of these skeletons was fortunately, or skilfully, suited to the popular prejudice of the gradual decrease of the human stature; which has prevailed in every age since the time of Homer.

Grandiaque effossis mirabitur ossa sepulchris.

promote the designs of Ambrose. The bones of the martyrs, their blood, their garments, were supposed to contain a healing power; and the præternatural influence was communicated to the most distant objects, without losing any part of its original virtue. The extraordinary cure of a blind man,[1] and the reluctant confessions of several dæmoniacs, appeared to justify the faith and sanctity of Ambrose; and the truth of those miracles is attested by Ambrose himself, by his secretary Paulinus, and by his proselyte, the celebrated Augustin, who, at that time, professed the art of rhetoric in Milan. The reason of the present age may possibly approve the incredulity of Justina and her Arian court; who derided the theatrical representations, which were exhibited by the contrivance, and at the expence, of the archbishop.[2] Their effect, however, on the minds of the people, was rapid and irresistible; and the feeble sovereign of Italy found himself unable to contend with the favourite of heaven. The powers likewise of the earth interposed in the defence of Ambrose; the disinterested advice of Theodosius was the genuine result of piety and friendship; and the mask of religious zeal concealed the hostile and ambitious designs of the tyrant of Gaul.[3]

The reign of Maximus might have ended in peace and prosperity, could he have contented himself with the possession of three ample countries, which now constitute the three most flourishing kingdoms of modern Europe. But the aspiring usurper, whose sordid ambition was not dignified by the love of glory and of arms, considered his actual forces as the instruments only of his future greatness, and his success was the immediate cause of his destruction. The wealth which he extorted[4] from the oppressed provinces of Gaul, Spain, and Britain, was employed in levying and maintaining a formidable army of Barbarians, collected, for the most part, from the fiercest nations of Germany. The conquest of Italy was the object of his hopes and preparations; and he secretly meditated the ruin of an innocent youth, whose government was abhorred and despised by his Catholic subjects. But as Maximus wished to occupy, without resistance, the passes of the Alps, he received, with perfidious smiles, Domninus of Syria, the ambassador of Valentinian, and pressed him to accept the aid of a considerable body of troops, for the service of a Pannonian war. The penetration of Ambrose had discovered the snares of an enemy under the professions of friendship;[5] but the Syrian Domninus was corrupted, or deceived, by the liberal favour of the court of Treves; and the council of Milan obstinately rejected the suspicion of danger, with a blind confidence, which was the effect, not of courage, but of fear. The

[1] Ambros. ii. epist. xxii. 875. August. Confess. l. ix. c. 7. de Civ. Dei, l. xxii. c. 8. Paulin. in Vitâ St. Ambros. c. 14. in Append. Benedict. p. 4. The blind man's name was Severus; he touched the holy garment, recovered his sight, and devoted the rest of his life (at least 25 years) to the service of the church. I should recommend this miracle to our divines, if it did not prove the worship of relics, as well as the Nicene creed.

[2] Paulin. in Vit. St. Ambros. c. 5. in Append. Benedict. p. 5.

[3] Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. x. 190. 750. He partially allows the mediation of Theodosius; and capriciously rejects that of Maximus, though it is attested by Prosper, Sozomen, and Theodoret.

[4] The modest censure of Sulpic. (Dialog. iii. 15.) inflicts a much deeper wound than the feeble declamation of Pacatus (xii. 25.).

[5] Esto tutior adversus hominem, pacis involucro tegentem, was the wise caution of Ambrose (ii. 891.), after his return from his second embassy.

march (A.D. 387. Aug.) of the auxiliaries was guided by the ambassador; and they were admitted, without distrust, into the fortresses of the Alps. But the crafty tyrant followed, with hasty and silent footsteps, in the rear; and, as he diligently intercepted all intelligence of his motions, the gleam of armour, and the dust excited by the troops of cavalry, first announced the hostile approach of a stranger to the gates of Milan. In this extremity, Justina and her son might accuse their own imprudence, and the perfidious arts of Maximus; but they wanted time, and force, and resolution, to stand against the Gauls and Germans, either in the field, or within the walls of a large and disaffected city. Flight was their only hope, Aquileia their only refuge; and as Maximus now displayed his genuine character, the brother of Gratian might expect the same fate from the hands of the same assassin. Maximus entered Milan in triumph; and if the wise archbishop refused a dangerous and criminal connexion with the usurper, he might indirectly contribute to the success of his arms, by inculcating from the pulpit, the duty of resignation, rather than that of resistance.[1] The unfortunate Justina reached Aquileia in safety; but she distrusted the strength of the fortifications; she dreaded the event of a siege; and she resolved to implore the protection of the great Theodosius, whose power and virtue were celebrated in all the countries of the West. A vessel was secretly provided to transport the Imperial family; they embarked with precipitation in one of the obscure harbours of Venetia, or Istria; traversed the whole extent of the Hadriatic and Ionian seas; turned the extreme promontory of Peloponnesus; and, after a long, but successful, navigation, reposed themselves in the port of Thessalonica. All the subjects of Valentinian deserted the cause of a prince, who, by his abdication, had absolved them from the duty of allegiance; and if the little city of Æmona, on the verge of Italy, had not presumed to stop the career of his inglorious victory, Maximus would have obtained, without a struggle, the sole possession of the Western empire.

Instead of inviting his royal guests to the palace of Constantinople, Theodosius had some unknown reasons to fix their residence (A.D. 387.) at Thessalonica; but these reasons did not proceed from contempt or indifference, as he speedily made a visit to that city, accompanied by the greatest part of his court and senate. After the first tender expressions of friendship and sympathy, the pious emperor of the East gently admonished Justina, that the guilt of heresy was sometimes punished in this world, as well as in the next; and that the public profession of the Nicene faith would be the most efficacious step to promote the restoration of her son, by the satisfaction which it must occasion both on earth and in heaven. The momentous question of peace or war was referred, by Theodosius, to the deliberation of his council; and the arguments which might be alleged on the side of honour and justice, had acquired, since the death of Gratian, a considerable degree of additional weight. The persecution of the Imperial family, to which Theodosius himself had been indebted for his fortune, was now aggravated by recent and repeated injuries. Neither oaths nor treaties could

[1] Baronius (A.D. 387. No. 63.) applies to this season of public distress some of the penitential sermons of the archbishop.

restrain the boundless ambition of Maximus; and the delay of vigorous and decisive measures, instead of prolonging the blessings of peace, would expose the eastern empire to the danger of an hostile invasion. The Barbarians, who had passed the Danube, had lately assumed the character of soldiers and subjects, but their native fierceness was yet untamed; and the operations of a war, which would exercise their valour, and diminish their numbers, might tend to relieve the provinces from an intolerable oppression. Notwithstanding these specious and solid reasons, which were approved by a majority of the council, Theodosius still hesitated, whether he should draw the sword in a contest, which could no longer admit any terms of reconciliation; and his magnanimous character was not disgraced by the apprehensions which he felt for the safety of his infant sons, and the welfare of his exhausted people. In this moment of anxious doubt, while the fate of the Roman world depended on the resolution of a single man, the charms of the princess Galla most powerfully pleaded the cause of her brother Valentinian.[1] The heart of Theodosius was softened by the tears of beauty; his affections were insensibly engaged by the graces of youth and innocence: the art of Justina managed and directed the impulse of passion; and the celebration of the royal nuptials was the assurance and signal of the civil war. The unfeeling critics, who consider every amorous weakness as an indelible stain on the memory of a great and orthodox emperor, are inclined, on this occasion, to dispute the suspicious evidence of the historian Zosimus. For my own part, I shall frankly confess, that I am willing to find, or even to seek, in the revolutions of the world, some traces of the mild and tender sentiments of domestic life; and, amidst the crowd of fierce and ambitious conquerors, I can distinguish, with peculiar complacency, a gentle hero, who may be supposed to receive his armour from the hands of love. The alliance of the Persian king was secured by the faith of treaties; the martial Barbarians were persuaded to follow the standard, or to respect the frontiers, of an active and liberal monarch; and the dominions of Theodosius, from the Euphrates to the Adriatic, resounded with the preparations of war both by land and sea. The skilful disposition of the forces of the East seemed to multiply their numbers, and distracted the attention of Maximus. He had reason to fear, that a chosen body of troops, under the command of the intrepid Arbogastes, would direct their march along the banks of the Danube, and boldly penetrate through the Rhætian provinces into the centre of Gaul. A powerful fleet was equipped in the harbours of Greece and Epirus, with an apparent design, that as soon as the passage had been opened by a naval victory, Valentinian, and his mother, should land in Italy, proceed, without delay, to Rome, and occupy the majestic seat of religion and empire. In the mean while, Theodosius himself advanced at the head of a brave and disciplined army, to encounter his unworthy rival, who, after the siege of Æmona, had fixed his camp

[1] The flight of Valentinian, and the love of Theodosius for his sister, are related by Zos. (l. iv. 263.). Tillemont produces some weak and ambiguous evidence to antedate the second marriage of Theodosius (Hist. des Emp. v. 740.), and consequently to refute ces contes de Zosime, qui seroient trop contraires à la piété de Theodose.

in the neighbourhood of Siscia, a city of Pannonia, strongly fortified by the broad and rapid stream of the Save.

The veterans, who still remembered the long resistance, and successive resources, of the tyrant Magnentius, might prepare themselves for the labours of three bloody campaigns. But the contest with his successor, who, like him, had usurped the throne of the West, was easily decided in the term of two months[1] (A.D. 388. June—August), and within the space of 200 miles. The superior genius of the emperor of the East might prevail over the feeble Maximus; who in this important crisis showed himself destitute of military skill, or personal courage; but the abilities of Theodosius were seconded by the advantage which he possessed of a numerous and active cavalry. The Huns, the Alani, and, after their example, the Goths themselves, were formed into squadrons of archers; who fought on horseback, and confounded the steady valour of the Gauls and Germans, by the rapid motions of a Tartar war. After the fatigue of a long march, in the heat of summer, they spurred their foaming horses into the waters of the Save, swam the river in the presence of the enemy, and instantly charged and routed the troops who guarded the high ground on the opposite side. Marcellinus, the tyrant's brother, advanced to support them with the select cohorts, which were considered as the hope and strength of the army. The action, which had been interrupted by the approach of night, was renewed in the morning; and, after a sharp conflict, the surviving remnant of the bravest soldiers of Maximus threw down their arms at the feet of the conqueror. Without suspending his march, to receive the loyal acclamations of the citizens of Æmona, Theodosius pressed forwards, to terminate the war by the death or captivity of his rival, who fled before him with the diligence of fear. From the summit of the Julian Alps, he descended with such incredible speed into the plain of Italy, that he reached Aquileia on the evening of the first day; and Maximus, who found himself encompassed on all sides, had scarcely time to shut the gates of the city. But the gates could not long resist the effort of a victorious enemy; and the despair, the disaffection, the indifference of the soldiers and people, hastened the downfall of the wretched Maximus. He was dragged from his throne, rudely stripped of the Imperial ornaments, the robe, the diadem, and the purple slippers; and conducted, like a malefactor, to the camp and presence of Theodosius, at a place about three miles from Aquileia. The behaviour of the emperor was not intended to insult, and he showed some disposition to pity and forgive, the tyrant of the West, who had never been his personal enemy, and was now become the object of his contempt. Our sympathy is the most forcibly excited by the misfortunes to which we are exposed; and the spectacle of a proud competitor, now prostrate at his feet, could not fail of producing very serious and solemn thoughts in the mind of the victorious emperor. But the feeble emotion of involuntary pity was checked by his regard for public justice, and the memory of Gratian; and he abandoned the victim to the pious zeal of the soldiers, who drew him out of the Imperial presence, and instantly separated his head from his body. The

[1] Godefroy's Chronol. of the Laws Cod. Theodos. i. p. cxix.

intelligence of his defeat and death was received with sincere or well-dissembled joy: his son Victor, on whom he had conferred the title of Augustus, died by the order, perhaps by the hand, of the bold Arbogastes; and all the military plans of Theodosius were successfully executed. When he had thus terminated the civil war, with less difficulty and bloodshed than he might naturally expect, he employed the winter months of his residence at Milan, to restore the state of the afflicted provinces; and early in the spring he made, after the example of Constantine and Constantius, his triumphal entry into the ancient capital of the Roman empire.[1]

The orator, who may be silent without danger, may praise without difficulty, and without reluctance;[2] and posterity will confess, that the character of Theodosius[3] might furnish the subject of a sincere and ample panegyric. The wisdom of his laws, and the success of his arms, rendered his administration respectable in the eyes both of his subjects and of his enemies. He loved and practised the virtues of domestic life, which seldom hold their residence in the palaces of kings. Theodosius was chaste and temperate: he enjoyed, without excess, the sensual and social pleasures of the table: and the warmth of his amorous passions was never diverted from their lawful objects. The proud titles of Imperial greatness were adorned by the tender names of a faithful husband, an indulgent father; his uncle was raised, by his affectionate esteem, to the rank of a second parent: Theodosius embraced, as his own, the children of his brother and sister; and the expressions of his regard were extended to the most distant and obscure branches of his numerous kindred. His familiar friends were judiciously selected from among those persons, who, in the equal intercourse of private life, had appeared before his eyes without a mask: the consciousness of personal and superior merit enabled him to despise the accidental distinction of the purple; and he proved by his conduct, that he had forgotten all the injuries, while he most gratefully remembered all the favours and services, which he had received before he ascended the throne of the Roman empire. The serious, or lively, tone of his conversation, was adapted to the age, the rank, or the character, of his subjects whom he admitted into his society; and the affability of his manners displayed the image of his mind. Theodosius respected the simplicity of the good and virtuous; every art, every talent, of an useful, or even of an innocent, nature, was rewarded by his judicious liberality; and, except the heretics, whom he persecuted with implacable hatred, the diffusive circle of his benevolence was circumscribed only by the limits of the human

[1] Besides the hints which may be gathered from chronicles and ecclesiastical history, Zos. (l. iv. 259.), Oros. (l. vii. c. 35.), and Pacatus (in Paneg. Vet. xii. 30.), supply the loose and scanty materials of this civil war. Ambrose (ii. epist. xl. 952.) darkly alludes to the well known events of a magazine surprised, an action at Petovio, a Sicilian, perhaps a naval, victory, &c. Auson. (p. 256. ed. Toll.) applauds the peculiar merit, and good fortune, of Aquileia.

[2] Quam promptum laudare principem, tam tutum siluisse de principe (Pact. in Paneg. Vet. xii. 2.). Latinus Pacatus Drepanius, a native of Gaul, pronounced this oration at Rome (A.D. 388.). He was afterwards proconsul of Africa; and his friend Ausonius praises him as a poet. second only to Virgil. Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 303.

[3] See the fair portrait of Theodosius, by the younger Victor; the strokes are distinct, and the colours are mixed. The praise of Pacatus is too vague: and Claudian always seems afraid of exalting the father above the son.

race. The government of a mighty empire may assuredly suffice to occupy the time, and the abilities, of a mortal: yet the diligent prince, without aspiring to the unsuitable reputation of profound learning, always reserved some moments of his leisure for the instructive amusement of reading. History, which enlarged his experience, was his favourite study. The annals of Rome, in the long period of eleven hundred years, presented him with a various and splendid picture of human life; and it has been particularly observed, that whenever he perused the cruel acts of Cinna, of Marius, or of Sylla, he warmly expressed his generous detestation of those enemies of humanity and freedom. His disinterested opinion of past events was usefully applied as the rule of his own actions; and Theodosius has deserved the singular commendation, that his virtues always seemed to expand with his fortune: the season of his prosperity was that of his moderation; and his clemency appeared the most conspicuous after the danger and success of the civil war. The Moorish guards of the tyrant had been massacred in the first heat of the victory; and a small number of the most obnoxious criminals suffered the punishment of the law. But the emperor showed himself much more attentive to relieve the innocent, than to chastise the guilty. The oppressed subjects of the West, who would have deemed themselves happy in the restoration of their lands, were astonished to receive a sum of money equivalent to their losses; and the liberality of the conqueror supported the aged mother, and educated the orphan daughters, of Maximus.[1] A character thus accomplished, might almost excuse the extravagant supposition of the orator Pacatus; that, if the elder Brutus could be permitted to revisit the earth, the stern republican would abjure, at the feet of Theodosius, his hatred of kings; and ingenuously confess, that such a monarch was the most faithful guardian of the happiness and dignity of the Roman people.—*Pacat. in Panegyr. Vet.* xii. 20.

Yet the piercing eye of the founder of the republic must have discerned two essential imperfections, which might, perhaps, have abated his recent love of despotism. The virtuous mind of Theodosius was often relaxed by indolence,[2] and it was sometimes inflamed by passion.[3] In the pursuit of an important object, his active courage was capable of the most vigorous exertions; but, as soon as the design was accomplished, or the danger was surmounted, the hero sunk into inglorious repose; and, forgetful that the time of a prince is the property of his people, resigned himself to the enjoyment of the innocent, but trifling, pleasures of a luxurious court. The natural disposition of Theodosius was hasty and choleric; and, in a station where none could resist, and few would dissuade, the fatal consequence of his resentment, the

[1] Ambros. ii. epist. xl. 955. Pacatus, from the want of skill, or of courage, omits this glorious circumstance.

[2] Zos. l. iv. 271. His partial evidence is marked by an air of candour and truth. He observes these vicissitudes of sloth, and activity, not as a vice, but as a singularity, in the character of Theodosius.

[3] This choleric temper is acknowledged, and excused, by Victor. Sed habes (says Ambrose, in decent and manly language, to his sovereign) naturæ impetum, quem si quis lenire velit, cito vertes ad misericordiam: si quis stimulet, in magis exsuscitas, ut eum revocare vix possis (ii. epist. li. 998.). Theodosius (Claud. in iv. Cons. Hon. 266, &c.) exhorts his son to moderate his anger.

humane monarch was justly alarmed by the consciousness of his infirmity, and of his power. It was the constant study of his life to suppress, or regulate, the intemperate sallies of passion; and the success of his efforts enhanced the merit of his clemency. But the painful virtue, which claims the merit of victory, is exposed to the danger of defeat; and the reign of a wise and merciful prince was polluted by an act of cruelty, which would stain the annals of Nero or Domitian. Within the space of three years, the inconsistent historian of Theodosius must relate the generous pardon of the citizens of Antioch, and the inhuman massacre of the people of Thessalonica.

The lively impatience of the inhabitants of Antioch was never satisfied with their own situation, or with the character, and conduct, of their successive sovereigns. The Arian subjects of Theodosius deplored the loss of their churches; and, as three rival bishops disputed the throne of Antioch, the sentence which decided their pretensions excited the murmurs of the two unsuccessful congregations. The exigencies of the Gothic war (A.D. 387), and the inevitable expence that accompanied the conclusion of the peace, had constrained the emperor to aggravate the weight of the public impositions; and the provinces of Asia, as they had not been involved in the distress, were the less inclined to contribute to the relief, of Europe. The auspicious period now approached of the tenth year of his reign; a festival more grateful to the soldiers, who received a liberal donative, than to the subjects, whose voluntary offerings had been long since converted into an extraordinary and oppressive burthen. The edicts of taxation interrupted the repose and pleasures of Antioch; and the tribunal of the magistrate was besieged by a suppliant crowd; who, in pathetic, but, at first, in respectful, language, solicited the redress of their grievances. They were gradually incensed by the pride of their haughty rulers, who treated their complaints as a criminal resistance; their satirical wit degenerated into sharp and angry invectives; and, from the subordinate powers of government, the invectives of the people insensibly rose to attack the sacred character of the emperor himself. Their fury (Feb. 26), provoked by a feeble opposition, discharged itself on the images of the Imperial family, which were erected as objects of public veneration, in the most conspicuous places of the city. The statues of Theodosius, of his father, of his wife Flaccilla, of his two sons, Arcadius and Honorius, were insolently thrown down from their pedestals, broken in pieces, or dragged with contempt through the streets: and the indignities which were offered to the representations of Imperial majesty, sufficiently declared the impious and treasonable wishes of the populace. The tumult was almost immediately suppressed by the arrival of a body of archers; and Antioch had leisure to reflect on the nature and consequences of her crime.[1] According to the duty of his office, the governor of the province dispatched a faithful narrative of the whole transaction; while the trembling citizens intrusted the confession of their crime, and the assurance of their repentance, to the zeal of Flavian their bishop, and

[1] The Christians and Pagans agreed in believing, that the sedition of Antioch was excited by the dæmons. A gigantic woman (Soz. l. vii. c. 23.) paraded the streets with a scourge in her and. An old man (Liban. Orat. xii. 396.) transformed himself into a youth, then a boy, &c.

to the eloquence of the senator Hilarius, the friend, and most probably the disciple, of Libanius; whose genius, on this melancholy occasion, was not useless to his country.[1] But the two capitals, Antioch and Constantinople, were separated by the distance of 800 miles; and, notwithstanding the diligence of the Imperial posts, the guilty city was severely punished by a long and dreadful interval of suspence. Every rumour agitated the hopes and fears of the Antiochians; and they heard with terror, that their sovereign, exasperated by the insult which had been offered to his own statues, and, more especially, to those of his beloved wife, had resolved to level with the ground the offending city; and to massacre, without distinction of age or sex, the criminal inhabitants;[2] many of whom were actually driven, by their apprehensions, to seek a refuge in the mountains of Syria, and the adjacent desert. At length, twenty-four days after the sedition (Mar. 22), the general Hellebicus, and Cæsarius, master of the offices, declared the will of the emperor, and the sentence of Antioch. That proud capital was degraded from the rank of a city; and the metropolis of the East, stripped of its lands, its privileges, and its revenues, was subjected, under the humiliating denomination of a village, to the jurisdiction of Laodicea.[3] The Baths, the Circus, and the theatres, were shut: and, that every source of plenty and pleasure might at the same time be intercepted, the distribution of corn was abolished, by the severe instructions of Theodosius. His commissioners then proceeded to inquire into the guilt of individuals; of those who had perpetrated, and of those who had not prevented, the destruction of the sacred statues. The tribunal of Hellebicus and Cæsarius, encompassed with armed soldiers, was erected in the midst of the Forum. The noblest, and most wealthy, of the citizens of Antioch, appeared before them in chains; the examination was assisted by the use of torture, and their sentence was pronounced or suspended, according to the judgment of these extraordinary magistrates. The houses of the criminals were exposed to sale, their wives and children were suddenly reduced, from affluence and luxury, to the most abject distress; and a bloody execution was expected to conclude the horrors of a day,[4] which the preacher of Antioch, the eloquent Chrysostom, has represented as a lively image of the last and universal judgment of the world. But the ministers of Theodosius performed, with reluctance, the cruel task which had been assigned them; they dropped a gentle tear over the calamities of the people; and they listened with reverence to the pressing solicitations of the monks and hermits, who descended in swarms from the mountains.[5] Hellebicus and Cæsarius were per-

[1] Zosimus, in his short and disingenuous account (l. iv. 258.) is certainly mistaken in sending Libanius himself to Constantinople. His own orations fix him at Antioch.

[2] Liban. (Orat. i. 6. ed. Venet.) declares, that, under such a reign, the fear of a massacre was groundless and absurd, especially in the emperor's absence; for his presence, according to the eloquent slave, might have given a sanction to the most bloody acts.

[3] Laodicea, on the sea-coast, 65 miles from Antioch (Noris Epoch. Syro-Maced. Dissert. iii. 230.). The Antiochians were offended, that the dependent city of Seleucia should presume to intercede for them.

[4] As the days of the tumult depend on the *moveable* festival of Easter, they can only be determined by the previous determination of the year. The year 387 has been preferred, after a laborious inquiry, by Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 741.) and Montfaucon (Chrysostom, xiii. 105.).

[5] Chrysostom opposes *their* courage, which was not attended with much risk, to the cowardly flight of the Cynics.

suaded to suspend the execution of their sentence; and it was agreed, that the former should remain at Antioch, while the latter returned, with all possible speed, to Constantinople; and presumed once more to consult the will of his sovereign. The resentment of Theodosius had already subsided; the deputies of the people, both the bishop and the orator, had obtained a favourable audience; and the reproaches of the emperor were the complaints of injured friendship, rather than the stern menaces of pride and power. A free and general pardon was granted to the city and citizens of Antioch; the prison-doors were thrown open; and senators, who despaired of their lives, recovered the possession of their houses and estates; and the capital of the East was restored to the enjoyment of her ancient dignity and splendour. Theodosius condescended (April 25) to praise the senate of Constantinople, who had generously interceded for their distressed brethren: he rewarded the eloquence of Hilarius with the government of Palestine; and dismissed the bishop of Antioch with the warmest expressions of his respect and gratitude. A thousand new statues arose to the clemency of Theodosius; the applause of his subjects was ratified by the approbation of his own heart; and the emperor confessed, that, if the exercise of justice is the most important duty, the indulgence of mercy is the most exquisite pleasure, of a sovereign.[1]

The sedition of Thessalonica (A.D. 390) is ascribed to a more shameful cause, and was productive of much more dreadful consequences. That great city, the metropolis of all the Illyrian provinces, had been protected from the dangers of the Gothic war by strong fortifications, and a numerous garrison. Botheric, the general of those troops, and, as it should seem from his name, a Barbarian, had among his slaves a beautiful boy, who excited the impure desires of one of the charioteers of the Circus. The insolent and brutal lover was thrown into prison by the order of Botheric; and he sternly rejected the importunate clamours of the multitude, who, on the day of the public games, lamented the absence of their favourite; and considered the skill of a charioteer as an object of more importance than his virtue. The resentment of the people was embittered by some previous disputes; and, as the strength of the garrison had been drawn away for the service of the Italian war, the feeble remnant, whose numbers were reduced by desertion, could not save the unhappy general from their licentious fury. Botheric, and several of his principal officers, were inhumanly murdered: their mangled bodies were dragged about the streets; and the emperor, who then resided at Milan, was surprised by the intelligence of the audacious and wanton cruelty of the people of Thessalonica. The sentence of a dispassionate judge would have inflicted a severe punishment on the authors of the crime; and the merit of Botheric might contribute to exasperate the grief and indignation of his master. The fiery and choleric temper of Theodosius was impatient of the dilatory forms of a judicial enquiry; and he

[1] The sedition of Antioch is represented in a lively, and almost dramatic, manner, by two orators, who had their respective shares of interest and merit. Liban. (Orat. xiv, xv. 389. ed. Morel. Orat. i. 1—14. Ven. 1754.), and the twenty orations of St. John Chrysostom, *de Statuis* (ii. 1—225. ed. Montfaucon.). I do not pretend to *much* personal acquaintance with Chrysostom; but Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 263.) and Hermant (Vie de St. Chrysost. i. 137.) had read him with pious curiosity, and diligence.

hastily resolved, that the blood of his lieutenant should be expiated by the blood of the guilty people. Yet his mind still fluctuated between the counsels of clemency and of revenge; the zeal of the bishops had almost extorted from the reluctant emperor the promise of a general pardon; his passion was again inflamed by the flattering suggestions of his minister Rufinus; and, after Theodosius had dispatched the messengers of death, he attempted, when it was too late, to prevent the execution of his orders. The punishment of a Roman city was blindly committed to the undistinguishing sword of the Barbarians; and the hostile preparations were concerted with the dark and perfidious artifice of an illegal conspiracy. The people of Thessalonica were treacherously invited, in the name of their sovereign, to the games of their Circus; and such was their insatiate avidity for those amusements, that every consideration of fear, or suspicion, was disregarded by the numerous spectators. As soon as the assembly was complete, the soldiers, who had secretly been posted round the Circus, received the signal, not of the races, but of a general massacre. The promiscuous carnage continued three hours, without discrimination of strangers or natives, of age or sex, of innocence or guilt; the most moderate accounts state the number of the slain at 7000; and it is affirmed by some writers, that more than 15,000 victims were sacrificed to the manes of Botheric. A foreign merchant, who had probably no concern in his murder, offered his own life, and all his wealth, to supply the place of *one* of his two sons; but, while the father hesitated with equal tenderness, while he was doubtful to chuse, and unwilling to condemn, the soldiers determined his suspense, by plunging their daggers at the same moment into the breasts of the defenceless youths. The apology of the assassins, that they were obliged to produce the prescribed number of heads, serves only to increase, by an appearance of order and design, the horrors of the massacre, which was executed by the commands of Theodosius. The guilt of the emperor is aggravated by his long and frequent residence at Thessalonica. The situation of the unfortunate city, the aspect of the streets and buildings, the dress and faces of the inhabitants, were familiar, and even present, to his imagination; and Theodosius possessed a quick and lively sense of the existence of the people whom he destroyed.[1]

The respectful attachment of the emperor for the orthodox clergy, had disposed him (A.D. 388) to love and admire the character of Ambrose; who united all the episcopal virtues in the most eminent degree. The friends and ministers of Theodosius imitated the example of their sovereign; and he observed, with more surprise than displeasure, that all his secret counsels were immediately communicated to the archbishop; who acted from the laudable persuasion, that every measure of civil government may have some connexion with the glory of God, and the interest of the true religion. The monks and populace of Callinicum, an obscure town on the frontier of Persia, excited

[1] The original evidence of Ambrose (ii. epist. li. 998.), Aug. (de Civ. Dei, v. 26.), and Paulinus (in Vit. Ambros. c. 24.), is delivered in vague expressions of horror and pity. It is illustrated by the subsequent and unequal testimonies of Soz. (l. vii. c. 25.), Theod. (l. v. c. 17), Theophanes (Chronograph. p. 62.), Cedrenus (p. 317.), and Zon. (ii. l. xiii. 34.). Zosimus *alone*, the partial enemy of Theodosius, most unaccountably passes over in silence the worst of his actions.

by their own fanaticism, and by that of their bishop, had tumultuously burnt a conventicle of the Valentinians, and a synagogue of the Jews. The seditious prelate was condemned, by the magistrate of the province, either to rebuild the synagogue, or to repay the damage; and this moderate sentence was confirmed by the emperor. But it was not confirmed by the archbishop of Milan.[1] He dictated an epistle of censure and reproach, more suitable, perhaps, if the emperor had received the mark of circumcision, and renounced the faith of his baptism. Ambrose considers the toleration of the Jewish, as the persecution of the Christian religion; boldly declares, that he himself, and every true believer, would eagerly dispute with the bishop of Callinicum the merit of the deed, and the crown of martyrdom; and laments, in the most pathetic terms, that the execution of the sentence would be fatal to the fame and salvation of Theodosius. As this private admonition did not produce an immediate effect, the archbishop, from his pulpit,[2] publicly addressed the emperor on his throne;[3] nor would he consent to offer the oblation of the altar, till he had obtained from Theodosius a solemn and positive declaration, which secured the impunity of the bishop and monks of Callinicum. The recantation of Theodosius was sincere;[4] and, during the term of his residence at Milan, his affection for Ambrose was continually increased by the habits of pious and familiar conversation.

When Ambrose was informed of the massacre of Thessalonica, his mind was filled with horror and anguish. He retired into the country to indulge his grief, and to avoid the presence of Theodosius. But as the archbishop was satisfied that a timid silence would render him the accomplice of his guilt, he represented, in a private letter, the enormity of the crime; which could only be effaced by the tears of penitence. The episcopal vigour of Ambrose was tempered by prudence; and he contented himself with signifying[5] an indirect sort of excommunication, by the assurance, that he had been warned in a vision, not to offer the oblation in the name, or in the presence, of Theodosius; and by the advice, that he would confine himself to the use of prayer, without presuming to approach the altar of Christ, or to receive the holy eucharist with those hands that were still polluted with the blood of an innocent people. The emperor was deeply affected by his own reproaches, and by those of his spiritual father; and, after he had bewailed the mischievous and irreparable consequences of his rash fury, he proceeded, in the accustomed manner, to perform his devotions in the great church of Milan. He was

[1] Ambrose (ii. epist. xl, xli. 946.), and his biographer Paulinus (c. 23.). Bayle and Barbeyrac (Morales des Pères, c. xvii. 325.) have justly condemned the archbishop.

[2] His sermon is a strange allegory of Jeremiah's rod, of an almond-tree, of the woman who washed and anointed the feet of Christ. But the peroration is direct and personal.

[3] Hodie, Episcope, de me proposuisti. Ambrose modestly confessed it: but he sternly reprimanded Timasius, general of the horse and foot, who had presumed to say, that the monks of Callinicum deserved punishment.

[4] Yet, five years afterwards, when Theodosius was absent from his spiritual guide, he tolerated the Jews, and condemned the destruction of their synagogue. Cod. Theod. l. xvi. tit. viii. leg. 9. Godefroy, vi. 225.

[5] Ambros. ii. epist. li. 997. His Epistle is a miserable rhapsody on a noble subject. Ambrose could act better than he could write. His compositions are destitute of taste, or genius; without the spirit of Tertullian, the copious elegance of Lactantius, the lively wit of Jerom, or the grave energy of Augustin.

(A.D. 390) stopped in the porch by the archbishop; who, in the tone and language of an ambassador of Heaven, declared to his sovereign, that private contrition was not sufficient to atone for a public fault, or to appease the justice of the offended Deity. Theodosius humbly represented, that if he had contracted the guilt of homicide, David, the man after God's own heart, had been guilty, not only of murder, but of adultery. "You have imitated David in his crime, imitate then his "repentance," was the reply of the undaunted Ambrose. The rigorous conditions of peace and pardon were accepted; and the public penance of the emperor Theodosius has been recorded as one of the most honourable events in the annals of the church. According to the mildest rules of ecclesiastical discipline, which were established in the fourth century, the crime of homicide was expiated by the penitence of twenty years:[1] and as it was impossible, in the period of human life, to purge the accumulated guilt of the massacre of Thessalonica, the murderer should have been excluded from the holy communion till the hour of his death. But the archbishop, consulting the maxims of religious policy, granted some indulgence to the rank of his illustrious penitent, who humbled in the dust the pride of the diadem; and the public edification might be admitted as a weighty reason to abridge the duration of his punishment. It was sufficient, that the emperor of the Romans, stripped of the ensigns of royalty, should appear in a mournful and suppliant posture; and that, in the midst of the church of Milan, he should humbly solicit, with sighs and tears, the pardon of his sins.[2] In this spiritual cure, Ambrose employed the various methods of mildness and severity. After a delay of about eight months, Theodosius was restored to the communion of the faithful; and the edict, which interposes a salutary interval of thirty days between the sentence and the execution, may be accepted as the worthy fruits of his repentance.[3] Posterity has applauded the virtuous firmness of the archbishop: and the example of Theodosius may prove the beneficial influence of those principles, which could force a monarch, exalted above the apprehension of human punishment, to respect the laws, and ministers, of an invisible Judge. "The prince," says Montesquieu, "who is actuated by the hopes and "fears of religion, may be compared to a lion, docile only to the "voice, and tractable to the hand, of his keeper."[4] The motions of the royal animal will therefore depend on the inclination, and interest, of the man who has acquired such dangerous authority over him; and the priest, who holds in his hand the conscience of a king, may inflame, or moderate, his sanguinary passions. The cause of humanity,

[1] According to the discipline of St. Basil (Canon lvi.), the voluntary homicide was 4 years a mourner; 5 an hearer; 7 in a prostrate state; and 4 in a standing posture. I have the original (Beveridge, Pandect. ii. 47.) and a translation (Chardon, Hist. des Sacrem. iv. 219.) of the Canonical Epistles of St. Basil.

[2] The penance of Theodosius is authenticated by Ambrose (vi. de Obit. Theodos. c. 34. p. 1207.), Aug. (de Civ. Dei, v. 26.), and Paulinus (in Vit. Ambros. c. 24.). Socrates is ignorant; Sos. (l. vii. c. 25.) concise; and the copious narrative of Theodor. (l. v. c. 18.) must be used with precaution.

[3] Codex. Theod. l. ix. tit. xl. leg. 13. The date and circumstances of this law are perplexed with difficulties; but I feel myself inclined to favour the honest efforts of Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 721.) and Pagi (Crit. i. 578.).

[4] Un prince qui aime la religion, et qui la craint, est un lion qui cède à la main qui le flatte, ou à la voix qui l'appaise. Esprit des Loix, l. xxiv. c. 2.

and that of persecution, have been asserted by the same Ambrose, with equal energy, and with equal success.

After the defeat and death of the tyrant of Gaul, the Roman world was in the possession (A.D. 388—391) of Theodosius. He derived from the choice of Gratian his honourable title to the provinces of the East: he had acquired the West by the right of conquest; and the three years, which he spent in Italy, were usefully employed to restore the authority of the laws; and to correct the abuses, which had prevailed with impunity under the usurpation of Maximus, and the minority of Valentinian. The name of Valentinian was regularly inserted in the public acts: but the tender age, and doubtful faith, of the son of Justina, appeared to require the prudent care of an orthodox guardian; and his specious ambition might have excluded the unfortunate youth, without a struggle, and almost without a murmur, from the administration, and even from the inheritance, of the empire. If Theodosius had consulted the rigid maxims of interest and policy, his conduct would have been justified by his friends; but the generosity of his behaviour on this memorable occasion has extorted the applause of his most inveterate enemies. He seated Valentinian on the throne of Milan; and, without stipulating any present or future advantages, restored him to the absolute dominion of all the provinces from which he had been driven by the arms of Maximus. To the restitution of his ample patrimony, Theodosius added the free and generous gift of the countries beyond the Alps, which his successful valour had recovered from the assassin of Gratian.[1] Satisfied with the glory which he had acquired, by revenging the death of his benefactor, and delivering the West from the yoke of tyranny, the emperor returned from Milan to Constantinople; and, in the peaceful possession of the East, insensibly relapsed into his former habits of luxury and indolence. Theodosius discharged his obligation to the brother, he indulged his conjugal tenderness to the sister, of Valentinian: and posterity, which admires the pure and singular glory of his elevation, must applaud his unrivalled generosity in the use of victory.

The empress Justina did not long survive her return to Italy; and, though she beheld the triumph of Theodosius, she was not allowed (A.D. 391) to influence the government of her son.[2] The pernicious attachment to the Arian sect, which Valentinian had imbibed from her example and instructions, were soon erased by the lessons of a more orthodox education. His growing zeal for the faith of Nice, and his filial reverence for the character, and authority, of Ambrose, disposed the Catholics to entertain the most favourable opinion of the virtues of the young emperor of the West.[3] They applauded his chastity and temperance, his contempt of pleasure, his application to business, and his tender affection for his two sisters; which could not,

[1] Τουτο περι τους ευεργετας καθηκον εδοξεν ειναι, is the niggard praise of Zosimus himself (l. iv. 267.). Augustin says, with some happiness of expression, Valentinianum . . . misericordissimâ veneratione restituit.

[2] Sozomen, l. vii. c. 14. His chronology is very irregular.

[3] Ambrose (ii. de Obit. Valentinian. c. 15. 1178; c. 36. 1184.). When the young emperor gave an entertainment, he fasted himself. Since he ordered his wild beasts to be killed, it is ungenerous in Philostorg. (l. xi. c. 1.) to reproach him with the love of that amusement.

however, seduce his impartial equity to pronounce an unjust sentence against the meanest of his subjects. But this amiable youth, before he had accomplished the twentieth year of his age, was oppressed by domestic treason; and the empire was again involved in the horrors of a civil war. Arbogastes,[1] a gallant soldier of the nation of the Franks, held the second rank in the service of Gratian. On the death of his master, he joined the standard of Theodosius; contributed, by his valour and military conduct, to the destruction of the tyrant; and was appointed, after the victory, master-general of the armies of Gaul. His real merit, and apparent fidelity, had gained the confidence both of the prince and people; his boundless liberality corrupted the allegiance of the troops; and, whilst he was universally esteemed as the pillar of the state, the bold and crafty Barbarian was secretly determined, either to rule, or to ruin, the empire of the West. The important commands of the army were distributed among the Franks; the creatures of Arbogastes were promoted to all the honours and offices of the civil government; the progress of the conspiracy removed every faithful servant from the presence of Valentinian; and the emperor, without power, and without intelligence, insensibly sunk into the precarious and dependent condition of a captive.[2] The indignation which he expressed, though it might arise only from the rash and impatient temper of youth, may be candidly ascribed to the generous spirit of a prince, who felt that he was not unworthy to reign. He secretly invited the archbishop of Milan to undertake the office of a mediator; as the pledge of his sincerity, and the guardian of his safety. He contrived to apprise the emperor of the East of his helpless situation; and he declared, that, unless Theodosius could speedily march to his assistance, he must attempt to escape from the palace, or rather prison, of Vienna in Gaul, where he had imprudently fixed his residence in the midst of the hostile faction. But the hopes of relief were distant, and doubtful; and as every day furnished some new provocation, the emperor, without strength or counsel, too hastily resolved to risk an immediate contest with his powerful general. He received Arbogastes on the throne; and, as the count approached with some appearance of respect, delivered to him a paper, which dismissed him from all his employments. "My authority," replied Arbogastes with insulting coolness, "does not depend on the smile, or the frown, of a monarch;" and he contemptuously threw the paper on the ground. The indignant monarch snatched at the sword of one of the guards, which he struggled to draw from its scabbard; and it was not without some degree of violence that he was prevented from using the deadly weapon against his enemy, or against himself. A few days after this extraordinary quarrel, in which he had exposed his resentment and his weakness, the unfortunate Valentinian was found (A.D. 392. May 15) strangled in his apartment; and some pains were employed to disguise the manifest guilt of Arbogastes, and to persuade the world that the death of the young emperor had been the voluntary effect of

[1] Zos. (l. iv. 275.) praises the enemy of Theodosius. But he is detested by Socr. (l. v. c. 25.) and Oros. (l. vii. c. 35.).

[2] Greg. of Tours (l. ii. c. 9. 165. in vol. ii. of the Historians of France) has preserved a curious fragment of Sulpicius Alexander, an historian far more valuable than himself.

his own despair.[1] His body was conducted with decent pomp to the sepulchre of Milan; and the archbishop pronounced a funeral oration to commemorate his virtue, and his misfortunes.[2] On this occasion, the humanity of Ambrose tempted him to make a singular breach in his theological system; and to comfort the weeping sisters of Valentinian, by the firm assurance, that their pious brother, though he had not received the sacrament of baptism, was introduced, without difficulty, into the mansions of eternal bliss.[3]

The prudence of Arbogastes had prepared the success (A.D. 392—394) of his ambitious designs: and the provincials, in whose breasts every sentiment of patriotism or loyalty was extinguished, expected, with tame resignation, the unknown master, whom the choice of a Frank might place on the Imperial throne. But some remains of pride and prejudice still opposed the elevation of Arbogastes himself; and the judicious Barbarian thought it more advisable to reign under the name of some dependent Roman. He bestowed the purple on the rhetorician Eugenius;[4] whom he had already raised from the place of his domestic secretary, to the rank of master of the offices. In the course both of his private and public service, the count had always approved the attachment and abilities of Eugenius; his learning and eloquence, supported by the gravity of his manners, recommended him to the esteem of the people; and the reluctance, with which he seemed to ascend the throne, may inspire a favourable prejudice of his virtue and moderation. The ambassadors of the new emperor were immediately dispatched to the court of Theodosius, to communicate, with affected grief, the unfortunate accident of the death of Valentinian; and, without mentioning the name of Arbogastes, to request, that the monarch of the East would embrace, as his lawful colleague, the respectable citizen, who had obtained the unanimous suffrage of the armies and provinces of the West.[5] Theodosius was justly provoked, that the perfidy of a Barbarian should have destroyed, in a moment, the labours, and the fruit, of his former victory; and he was excited by the tears of his beloved wife,[6] to revenge the fate of her unhappy brother, and once more to assert by arms the violated majesty of the throne. But as the second conquest of the West was a task of difficulty and danger, he dismissed, with splendid presents, and an ambiguous answer, the ambassadors of Eugenius; and almost two years

[1] Godefroy (Dissertat. ad Philostorg. p. 429.) has diligently collected all the circumstances of the death of Valentinian II. The variations, and the ignorance of contemporary writers, prove that it was secret.

[2] De Obitû Valentinian. ii. 1173. He is forced to speak a discreet and obscure language: yet he is much bolder than any layman, or perhaps any other ecclesiastic, would have dared to be.

[3] See c. 51. p. 1188. c. 75. p. 1193. Don Chardon (Hist. des Sacrem. i. 86.), who owns that St. Ambrose most strenuously maintains the *indispensable* necessity of baptism, labours to reconcile the contradiction.

[4] Quem sibi Germanus famulum delegerat exul,

is the contemptuous expression of Claudian (iv. Cons. Hon. 74.). Eugenius professed Christianity; but his secret attachment to Paganism (Soz. l. vii. c. 22. Philostorg. l. xi. c. 2.) is probable in a grammarian, and would secure the friendship of Zosimus (l. iv. 276.).

[5] Zos. (l. iv. 278.) mentions this embassy; but he is diverted by another story from relating the event.

[6] Συνεταραξεν η τουτου γαμετη Γαλλα τα βασιλεια τον αδελφον ολοφυρομενη. Zos. l. iv. 277. He afterwards says (p. 280.), that Galla died in childbed; and intimates, that the affliction of her husband was extreme, but short.

were consumed in the preparations of the civil war. Before he formed any decisive resolution, the pious emperor was anxious to discover the will of Heaven; and as the progress of Christianity had silenced the oracles of Delphi and Dodona, he consulted an Egyptian monk, who possessed, in the opinion of the age, the gift of miracles, and the knowledge of futurity. Eutropius, one of the favourite eunuchs of the palace of Constantinople, embarked for Alexandria, from whence he sailed up the Nile as far as the city of Lycopolis, or of Wolves, in the remote province of Thebais.[1] In the neighbourhood of that city, and on the summit of a lofty mountain, the holy John[2] had constructed, with his own hands, an humble cell, in which he had dwelt above fifty years, without opening his door, without seeing the face of a woman, and without tasting any food that had been prepared by fire, or any human art. Five days of the week he spent in prayer and meditation; but on Saturdays and Sundays he regularly opened a small window, and gave audience to the crowd of suppliants, who successively flowed from every part of the Christian world. The eunuch of Theodosius approached the window with respectful steps, proposed his questions concerning the event of the civil war, and soon returned with a favourable oracle, which animated the courage of the emperor by the assurance of a bloody, but infallible, victory.[3] The accomplishment of the prediction was forwarded by all the means that human prudence could supply. The industry of the two master-generals, Stilicho and Timasius, was directed to recruit the numbers, and to revive the discipline, of the Roman legions. The formidable troops of Barbarians marched under the ensigns of their national chieftains. The Iberian, the Arab, and the Goth, who gazed on each other with mutual astonishment, were enlisted in the service of the same prince; and the renowned Alaric acquired, in the school of Theodosius, the knowledge of the art of war, which he afterwards so fatally exerted for the destruction of Rome.[4]

The emperor of the West, or, to speak more properly, his general Arbogastes, was instructed by the misconduct and misfortune of Maximus, how dangerous it might prove to extend the line of defence against a skilful antagonist, who was free to press or to suspend, to contract or to multiply, his various methods of attack.[5] Arbogastes

[1] Lycopolis is the modern Siut, or Osiot, a town of Said, about the size of St. Denys, which drives a profitable trade with the kingdom of Sennaar; and has a very convenient fountain, "cujus potû signa virginitatis eripiuntur." D'Anville, Descrip. de l'Egypte, p. 181. Abulfeda, Descrip. Ægyp. p. 14. and the curious Annotations, p. 25. 92. of his editor Michaelis.

[2] The life of John of Lycopolis is described by his two friends, Rufin. (l. ii. c. 1. p. 449.) and Palladius (Hist. Lausiac. c. 43. p. 738.), in Rosweyde's great collection of the Vitæ Patrum. Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. x. 718.) has settled the Chronology.

[3] Soz. l. vii. c. 22. Claudian (in Eutrop. l. i. 312.) mentions the eunuch's journey: but he most contemptuously derides the Egyptian dreams, and the oracles of the Nile.

[4] Zos. l. iv. 280. Socr l. vii. 10. Alaric himself (de Bell. Getico, 524.) dwells with more complacency on his early exploits against the Romans.

. . . . Tot Augustus Hebro qui teste fugavi.

Yet his vanity could scarcely have proved this *plurality* of flying emperors.

[5] Claudian (iv. Cons. Honor. 77.) contrasts the military plans of the two usurpers.

. . . . Novitas audere priorem
Suadebat; cautumque dabant exempla sequentem.
Hic nova moliri præceps: hic quærere tutus
Providus. Hic fusis; collectis viribus ille.
Hic vagus excurrens, his intra claustra reductus
Dissimiles; sed morte pares. . . . .

fixed his station on the confines of Italy: the troops of Theodosius were permitted to occupy, without resistance, the provinces of Pannonia, as far as the foot of the Julian Alps; and even the passages of the mountains were negligently, or perhaps artfully, abandoned, to the bold invader. He descended from the hills, and beheld, with some astonishment, the formidable camp of the Gauls and Germans, that covered with arms and tents the open country, which extends to the walls of Aquileia, and the banks of the Frigidus,[1] or Cold River.[2] This narrow theatre of the war, circumscribed by the Alps and the Hadriatic, did not allow much room for the operations of military skill; the spirit of Arbogastes would have disdained a pardon; his guilt extinguished the hope of a negociation; and Theodosius was impatient to satisfy his glory and revenge, by the chastisement of the assassins of Valentinian. Without weighing the natural and artificial obstacles that opposed his efforts, the emperor of the East (A.D. 394. Sep. 6) immediately attacked the fortifications of his rivals, assigned the post of honourable danger to the Goths, and cherished a secret wish, that the bloody conflict might diminish the pride and numbers of the conquerors. Ten thousand of those auxiliaries, and Bacurius, general of the Iberians, died bravely on the field of battle. But the victory was not purchased by their blood: the Gauls maintained their advantage; and the approach of night protected the disorderly flight, or retreat, of the troops of Theodosius. The emperor retired to the adjacent hills; where he passed a disconsolate night, without sleep, without provisions, and without hopes;[3] except that strong assurance, which, under the most desperate circumstances, the independent mind may derive from the contempt of fortune and of life. The triumph of Eugenius was celebrated by the insolent and dissolute joy of his camp; whilst the active and vigilant Arbogastes secretly detached a considerable body of troops to occupy the passes of the mountains, and to encompass the rear of the Eastern army. The dawn of day discovered to the eyes of Theodosius the extent and the extremity of his danger: but his apprehensions were soon dispelled, by a friendly message from the leaders of those troops, who expressed their inclination to desert the standard of the tyrant. The honourable and lucrative rewards, which they stipulated as the price of their perfidy, were granted without hesitation; and as ink and paper could not easily be procured, the emperor subscribed, on his own tablets, the ratification of the treaty. The spirit of his soldiers was revived by this seasonable reinforcement: and they again marched, with confidence, to surprise the camp of a tyrant, whose principal officers appeared to distrust, either the justice, or the success, of his arms. In the heat of the battle, a violent tempest,[4] such as is often

[1] The Frigidus, a small, though memorable, stream in the country of Goretz, now called the Vipao, falls into the Sontius, or Lisonzo, above Aquileia, some miles from the Hadriatic. D'Anville's Ancient and Modern Maps, and Italia Antiq. of Cluverius (i. 188.).

[2] Claudian's wit is intolerable: the snow was dyed red; the cold river smoked; and the channel must have been choked with carcasses, if the current had not been swelled with blood.

[3] Theodoret affirms, that St. John, and St. Philip, appeared to the waking, or sleeping, emperor, on horseback, &c. This is the first instance of apostolic chivalry, which afterwards became so popular in Spain, and in the Crusades.

[4] Te propter, gelidis Aquilo de monte procellis
Obruit adversas acies; revolutaque tela

felt among the Alps, suddenly arose from the East. The army of Theodosius was sheltered by their position from the impetuosity of the wind, which blew a cloud of dust in the faces of the enemy, disordered their ranks, wrested their weapons from their hands, and diverted, or repelled, their ineffectual javelins. This accidental advantage was skilfully improved; the violence of the storm was magnified by the superstitious terrors of the Gaul; and they yielded without shame to the invisible powers of heaven, who seemed to militate on the side of the pious emperor. His victory was decisive; and the deaths of his two rivals were distinguished only by the difference of their characters. The rhetorician Eugenius, who had almost acquired the dominion of the world, was reduced to implore the mercy of the conqueror; and the unrelenting soldiers separated his head from his body, as he lay prostrate at the feet of Theodosius. Arbogastes, after the loss of a battle, in which he had discharged the duties of a soldier and a general, wandered several days among the mountains. But when he was convinced that his cause was desperate, and his escape impracticable, the intrepid Barbarian imitated the example of the ancient Romans, and turned his sword against his own breast. The fate of the empire was determined in a narrow corner of Italy; and the legitimate successor of the house of Valentinian embraced the archbishop of Milan, and graciously received the submission of the provinces of the West. Those provinces were involved in the guilt of rebellion; while the inflexible courage of Ambrose alone had resisted the claims of successful usurpation. With a manly freedom, which might have been fatal to any other subject, the archbishop rejected the gifts of Eugenius, declined his correspondence, and withdrew himself from Milan, to avoid the odious presence of a tyrant; whose downfall he predicted in discreet and ambiguous language. The merit of Ambrose was applauded by the conqueror, who secured the attachment of the people by his alliance with the church: and the clemency of Theodosius is ascribed to the humane intercession of the archbishop of Milan.[1]

After the defeat of Eugenius, the merit, as well as the authority, of Theodosius was cheerfully acknowledged by all the inhabitants of the Roman world. The experience of his past conduct encouraged the most pleasing expectations of his future reign; and the age of the emperor, which did not exceed fifty years, seemed to extend the prospect of the public felicity. His death (A.D. 395. Jan. 17), only four months after his victory, was considered by the people as an unforeseen and fatal event, which destroyed, in a moment, the hopes of the rising generation. But the indulgence of ease and luxury had

Vertit in auctores, et turbine reppulit hastas.
O nimium dilecte Deo, cui fundit ab antris
Æolus armatas hyemes; cui militat Æther,
Et conjurati veniunt ad classica venti.

These famous lines of Claudian (iii. Cons. Honor. 93. A.D. 396.) are alleged by his contemporaries, Augustin and Orosius; who suppress the Pagan deity of Æolus; and add some circumstances from the information of eye-witnesses. Within four months after the victory, it was compared by Ambrose to the miraculous victories of Moses and Joshua.

[1] The events of this civil war are gathered from Ambrose (ii. epist. lxii. 1022.), Paulinus (Vit. Ambros. c. 26—34.), Aug. (de Civ. Dei, v. 26.), Oros. (l. vii. c. 35.), Soz. (l. vii. c. 24.), Theodor. (l. v. c. 24.), Zos. (l. iv. p. 281.), Claudian (iii. Cons. Hon. 63. iv. Cons. Hon. 70.), and the Chronicles published by Scaliger

secretly nourished the principles of disease.[1] The strength of Theodosius was unable to support the sudden and violent transition from the palace to the camp; and the increasing symptoms of a dropsy announced the speedy dissolution of the emperor. The opinion, and perhaps the interest, of the public had confirmed the division of the Eastern and Western empires; and the two royal youths, Arcadius and Honorius, who had already obtained, from the tenderness of their father, the title of Augustus, were destined to fill the thrones of Constantinople and of Rome. Those princes were not permitted to share the danger and glory of the civil war;[2] but as soon as Theodosius had triumphed over his unworthy rivals, he called his younger son, Honorius, to enjoy the fruits of the victory, and to receive the sceptre of the West from the hands of his dying father. The arrival of Honorius at Milan was welcomed by a splendid exhibition of the games of the Circus; and the emperor, though he was oppressed by the weight of his disorder, contributed by his presence to the public joy. But the remains of his strength were exhausted by the painful effort, which he made, to assist at the spectacles of the morning. Honorius supplied, during the rest of the day, the place of his father; and the great Theodosius expired in the ensuing night. Notwithstanding the recent animosities of a civil war, his death was universally lamented. The Barbarians, whom he had vanquished, and the churchmen, by whom he had been subdued, celebrated, with loud and sincere applause, the qualities of the deceased emperor which appeared the most valuable in their eyes. The Romans were terrified by the impending dangers of a feeble and divided administration; and every disgraceful moment of the unfortunate reigns of Arcadius and Honorius revived the memory of their irreparable loss.

In the faithful picture of the virtues of Theodosius, his imperfections have not been dissembled; the act of cruelty, and the habits of indolence, which tarnished the glory of one of the greatest of the Roman princes. An historian, perpetually adverse to the fame of Theodosius, has exaggerated his vices, and their pernicious effects; he boldly asserts, that every rank of subjects imitated the effeminate manners of their sovereign; that every species of corruption polluted the course of public and private life; and that the feeble restraints of order and decency were insufficient to resist the progress of that degenerate spirit, which sacrifices, without a blush, the consideration of duty and interest to the base indulgence of sloth and appetite.—*Zosimus*, l. iv. p. 244. The complaints of contemporary writers, who deplore the increase of luxury, and depravation of manners, are commonly expressive of their peculiar temper and situation. There are few observers, who possess a clear and comprehensive view of the revolutions of society; and who are capable of discovering the nice and secret springs of action, which impel, in the same uniform

[1] This disease, ascribed by Socr. (l. v. c. 26.) to the fatigues of war, is represented by Philostorg. (l. xi. c. 2.) as the effect of sloth and intemperance: for which Photius calls him an impudent liar (Godefroy, Dissert. p. 438.).

[2] Zosimus supposes, that the boy Honorius accompanied his father (l. iv. 280.). Yet the quanto flagrabant pectora voto, is all that flattery would allow to a contemporary poet; who clearly describes the emperor's refusal, and the journey of Honorius, *after* the victory (Claud. iii. Cons. 78.).

direction, the blind and capricious passions of a multitude of individuals. If it can be affirmed, with any degree of truth, that the luxury of the Romans was more shameless and dissolute in the reign of Theodosius than in the age of Constantine, perhaps, or of Augustus, the alteration cannot be ascribed to any beneficial improvements, which had gradually increased the stock of national riches. A long period of calamity or decay must have checked the industry, and diminished the wealth, of the people; and their profuse luxury must have been the result of that indolent despair, which enjoys the present hour, and declines the thoughts of futurity. The uncertain condition of their property discouraged the subjects of Theodosius from engaging in those useful and laborious undertakings which require an immediate expence, and promise a slow and distant advantage. The frequent examples of ruin and desolation tempted them not to spare the remains of a patrimony, which might, every hour, become the prey of the rapacious Goth. And the mad prodigality which prevails in the confusion of a shipwreck, or a siege, may serve to explain the progress of luxury amidst the misfortunes and terrors of a sinking nation.

The effeminate luxury, which infected the manners of courts and cities, had instilled a secret and destructive poison into the camps of the legions: and their degeneracy has been marked by the pen of a military writer, who had accurately studied the genuine and ancient principles of Roman discipline. It is the just and important observation of Vegetius, that the infantry was invariably covered with defensive armour, from the foundation of the city, to the reign of the emperor Gratian. The relaxation of discipline, and the disuse of exercise, rendered the soldiers less able, and less willing, to support the fatigues of the service; they complained of the weight of the armour, which they seldom wore; and they successively obtained the permission of laying aside both their cuirasses and their helmets. The heavy weapons of their ancestors, the short sword, and the formidable *pilum*, which had subdued the world, insensibly dropped from their feeble hands. As the use of the shield is incompatible with that of the bow, they reluctantly marched into the field; condemned to suffer, either the pain of wounds, or the ignominy of flight, and always disposed to prefer the more shameful alternative. The cavalry of the Goths, the Huns, and the Alani, had felt the benefits, and adopted the use, of defensive armour; and, as they excelled in the management of missile weapons, they easily overwhelmed the naked and trembling legions, whose heads and breasts were exposed, without defence, to the arrows of the Barbarians. The loss of armies, the destruction of cities, and the dishonour of the Roman name, ineffectually solicited the successors of Gratian to restore the helmets and cuirasses of the infantry. The enervated soldiers abandoned their own and the public defence; and their pusillanimous indolence may be considered as the immediate cause of the downfall of the empire.[1]

[1] Vegetius, de Re Militari, l. i. c. 10. The series of calamities, which he marks, compel us to believe, that the *Hero*, to whom he dedicates his book, is the last and most inglorious of the Valentinians.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Final Destruction of Paganism.—Introduction of the Worship of Saints, and Relics, among the Christians.

THE ruin of Paganism, in the age (A.D. 378—395) of Theodosius, is perhaps the only example of the total extirpation of any ancient and popular superstition; and may therefore deserve to be considered, as a singular event in the history of the human mind. The Christians, more especially the clergy, had impatiently supported the prudent delays of Constantine, and the equal toleration of the elder Valentinian; nor could they deem their conquest perfect or secure, as long as their adversaries were permitted to exist. The influence, which Ambrose and his brethren had acquired over the youth of Gratian and the piety of Theodosius, was employed to infuse the maxims of persecution into the breasts of their Imperial proselytes. Two specious principles of religious jurisprudence were established, from whence they deduced a direct and rigorous conclusion, against the subjects of the empire who still adhered to the ceremonies of their ancestors: *that* the magistrate is, in some measure, guilty of the crimes which he neglects to prohibit, or to punish; and, *that* the idolatrous worship of fabulous deities, and real dæmons, is the most abominable crime against the supreme majesty of the Creator. The laws of Moses, and the examples of Jewish history,[1] were hastily, perhaps erroneously, applied, by the clergy, to the mild and universal reign of Christianity.[2] The zeal of the emperors was excited to vindicate their own honour, and that of the Deity: and the temples of the Roman world were subverted, about sixty years after the conversion of Constantine.

From the age of Numa, to the reign of Gratian, the Romans preserved the regular succession of the several colleges of the sacerdotal order.[3] Fifteen PONTIFFS exercised their supreme jurisdiction over all things, and persons, that were consecrated to the service of the gods; and the various questions which perpetually arose in a loose and traditionary system, were submitted to the judgment of their holy tribunal. Fifteen grave and learned AUGURS observed the face of the heavens, and prescribed the actions of heroes, according to the flight of birds. Fifteen keepers of the Sibylline books (their name of QUINDECEMVIRS was derived from their number) occasionally consulted the history of future, and as it should seem, of contingent, events. Six VESTALS devoted their virginity to the guard of the sacred fire, and of the unknown pledges of the duration of Rome; which no mortal had

[1] St. Ambrose (ii. de Obit. Theod. p. 1208.) expressly praises and recommends the zeal of Josiah in the destruction of idolatry. The language of Julius Firmicus Maternus on the same subject (de Errore Profan. Relig. p. 467. ed Gronov.) is piously inhuman. Nec filio jubet (the Mosaic Law) parci, nec fratri, et per amatam conjugem gladium vindicem ducit, &c.

[2] Bayle (ii. 406, in his Comment. Philosoph.) justifies, and limits, these intolerant laws by the temporal reign of Jehovah over the Jews. The attempt is laudable.

[3] Outlines of the Roman hierarchy in Cicero (de Leg. ii. 8.), Livy (i. 20.), Dion. Halic. (l. ii. 119—129. ed. Hudson), Beaufort (Repub. Romaine, i. 1—90.), and Moyle (i. 10.). The last is the work of an English Whig, as well as of a Roman antiquary.

been suffered to behold with impunity.[1] Seven EPULOS prepared the table of the gods, conducted the solemn procession, and regulated the ceremonies of the annual festival. The three FLAMENS of Jupiter, of Mars, and of Quirinus, were considered as the peculiar ministers of the three most powerful deities, who watched over the fate of Rome and of the universe. The KING of the SACRIFICES represented the person of Numa, and of his successors, in the religious functions, which could be performed only by royal hands. The confraternities of the SALIANS, the LUPERCALS, &c. practised such rites, as might extort a smile of contempt from every reasonable man, with a lively confidence of recommending themselves to the favour of the immortal gods. The authority, which the Roman priests had formerly obtained in the counsels of the republic, was gradually abolished by the establishment of monarchy, and the removal of the seat of empire. But the dignity of their sacred character was still protected by the laws and manners of their country; and they still continued, more especially the college of pontiffs, to exercise in the capital, and sometimes in the provinces, the rights of their ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction. Their robes of purple, chariots of state, and sumptuous entertainments, attracted the admiration of the people; and they received, from the consecrated lands, and the public revenue, an ample stipend, which liberally supported the splendour of the priesthood, and all the expences of the religious worship of the state. As the service of the altar was not incompatible with the command of armies, the Romans, after their consulships and triumphs, aspired to the place of pontiff, or of augur; the seats of [2] Cicero and Pompey were filled, in the fourth century, by the most illustrious members of the senate; and the dignity of their birth reflected additional splendour on their sacerdotal character. The fifteen priests, who composed the college of pontiffs, enjoyed a more distinguished rank as the companions of their sovereign; and the Christian emperors condescended to accept the robe and ensigns, which were appropriated to the office of supreme pontiff. But when Gratian ascended the throne, more scrupulous, or more enlightened, he sternly rejected those profane symbols;[3] applied to the service of the state, or of the church, the revenues of the priests and vestals; abolished their honours and immunities; and dissolved the ancient fabric of Roman superstition, which was supported by the opinions, and habits, of eleven hundred years. Paganism was still the constitutional religion of the senate. The hall, or temple, in which they assembled, was adorned by the statue and altar of victory;[4] a majestic female standing on a globe, with flowing gar-

[1] These mystic, and perhaps imaginary, symbols have given birth to various fables and conjectures. It seems probable, that the Palladium was a small statue (three cubits and a half high) of Minerva, with a lance and distaff; that it was usually inclosed in a *seria*, or barrel; and that a similar barrel was placed by its side, to disconcert curiosity, or sacrilege. Mezeriac (Comment. sur les Epitres d'Ovide, i. 60.), and Lipsius (iii. 610. de Vestâ, &c. c. 10.).

[2] Cicero, frankly (ad Atticum, l. ii. epist. 5.), or indirectly (ad Familiar. l. xv. epist. 4.), confesses that the *Augurate* is the supreme object of his wishes. Pliny is proud to tread in the footsteps of Cicero (l. iv. epist. 8.), and the chain of tradition might be continued from history, and marbles.

[3] Zos. l. iv. 249. I have suppressed the foolish pun about *Pontifex* and *Maximus*.

[4] This statue was transported from Tarentum to Rome, placed in the *Curia Julia* by Cæsar, and decorated by Augustus with the spoils of Egypt

ments, expanded wings, and a crown of laurel in her out-stretched hand.[1] The senators were sworn on the altar of the goddess, to observe the laws of the emperor and of the empire; and a solemn offering of wine and incense was the ordinary prelude of their public deliberations.[2] The removal of this ancient monument was the only injury which Constantius had offered to the superstition of the Romans. The altar of Victory was again restored by Julian, tolerated by Valentinian, and once more banished from the senate by the zeal of Gratian.[3] But the emperor yet spared the statues of the gods which were exposed to the public veneration: four hundred and twenty-four temples, or chapels, still remained to satisfy the devotion of the people; and in every quarter of Rome, the delicacy of the Christians was offended by the fumes of idolatrous sacrifice.[4]

But the Christians formed the least numerous party in the senate of Rome;[5] and it was only by their absence, that they could express their dissent from the legal, though profane, acts of a Pagan majority. In that assembly, the dying embers of freedom were, for a moment, revived and inflamed by the breath of fanaticism. Four respectable deputations were successively voted to the Imperial court,[6] to represent the grievances of the priesthood and the senate; and to solicit the restoration of the altar of Victory. The conduct of this important business was entrusted (A. D. 384) to the eloquent Symmachus,[7] a wealthy and noble senator, who united the sacred characters of pontiff and augur, with the civil dignities of proconsul of Africa, and præfect of the city. The breast of Symmachus was animated by the warmest zeal for the cause of expiring Paganism; and his religious antagonists lamented the abuse of his genius, and the inefficacy of his moral virtues.[8] The orator, whose petition is extant to the emperor Valentinian, was conscious of the difficulty and danger of the office which he had assumed. He cautiously avoids every topic which might appear to reflect on the religion of his sovereign; humbly declares, that prayers and entreaties are his only arms; and artfully draws his arguments from the schools of rhetoric rather than from those of philosophy. Symmachus endeavours to seduce the imagination of a young prince, by displaying the attributes of the goddess of Victory; he insinuates, that the confiscation of the revenues, which were con-

[1] Prudentius (l. ii.) has drawn a very awkward portrait of Victory: but the curious reader will obtain more satisfaction from Montfaucon's Antiq. (i. 341.).

[2] Suetonius (in Aug. c. 35.), and Exordium of Pliny's Panegyric.

[3] These facts are allowed by the two advocates, Symmachus and Ambrose.

[4] The *Notitia Urbis*, more recent than Constantine, does not find one Christian church worthy to be named among the edifices of the city. Ambrose (ii. Epist. xvii. 825.) deplores the public scandals of Rome, which continually offended the eyes, the ears, and the nostrils of the faithful.

[5] Ambrose repeatedly affirms, in contradiction to common sense (Moyle's Works, ii. 147.), that the Christians had a majority in the senate.

[6] The *first* (A.D. 382.) to Gratian, who refused them audience. The *second* (A.D. 384.) to Valentinian, when the field was disputed by Symmachus and Ambrose. The *third* (A.D. 388.) to Theodosius; and the *fourth* (A.D. 392.) to Valentinian. Lardner (Heath. Testimon. iv. 372.) fairly represents the whole transaction.

[7] Symmachus, who was invested with all the civil and sacerdotal honours, represented the emperor under the two characters of *Pontifex Maximus*, and *Princeps Senatûs*. See the proud inscription at the head of his works.

[8] As if any one, says Prudentius (Symmach. i. 639.), should dig in the mud with an instrument of gold and ivory. Even saints, and polemic saints, treat this adversary with respect and civility.

secrated to the service of the gods, was a measure unworthy of his liberal and disinterested character; and he maintains, that the Roman sacrifices would be deprived of their force and energy, if they were no longer celebrated at the expence, as well as in the name, of the republic. Even scepticism is made to supply an apology for superstition. The great and incomprehensible *secret* of the universe eludes the enquiry of man. Where reason cannot instruct, custom may be permitted to guide; and every nation seems to consult the dictates of prudence by a faithful attachment to those rites, and opinions, which have received the sanction of ages. If those ages have been crowned with glory and prosperity, if the devout people has frequently obtained the blessings which they have solicited at the altars of the gods, it must appear still more advisable to persist in the same salutary practice; and not to risk the unknown perils that may attend any rash innovations. The test of antiquity and success was applied with singular advantage to the religion of Numa; and ROME herself, the celestial genius that presided over the fates of the city, is introduced by the orator to plead her own cause before the tribunal of the emperors. "Most excellent princes," says the venerable matron, "fathers "of your country; pity and respect my age, which has hitherto flowed "in an uninterrupted course of piety. Since I do not repent, permit "me to continue in the practice of my ancient rites. Since I am born "free, allow me to enjoy my domestic institutions. This religion has "reduced the world under my laws. These rites have repelled "Hannibal from the city, and the Gauls from the capitol. Were my "gray hairs reserved for such intolerable disgrace? I am ignorant of "the new system, that I am required to adopt; but I am well assured, "that the correction of old age is always an ungrateful and ignominious "office."[1] The fears of the people supplied what the discretion of the orator had suppressed; and the calamities, which afflicted, or threatened, the declining empire, were unanimously imputed, by the Pagans, to the new religion of Christ and of Constantine.

But the hopes of Symmachus were repeatedly baffled by the firm and dexterous opposition of the archbishop of Milan; who (A.D. 388, &c.), fortified the emperors against the fallacious eloquence of the advocate of Rome. In this controversy, Ambrose condescends to speak the language of a philosopher, and to ask, with some contempt, why it should be thought necessary to introduce an imaginary and invisible power, as the cause of those victories, which were sufficiently explained by the valour and discipline of the legions. He justly derides the absurd reverence for antiquity, which could only tend to discourage the improvements of art, and to replunge the human race into their original barbarism. From thence gradually rising to a more lofty and theological tone, he pronounces, that Christianity alone is the doctrine of truth and salvation; and that every mode of Polytheism conducts its deluded votaries, through the paths of error, to

[1] Fifty-fourth epistle of Symmachus, Book x. In the form and disposition of his ten books of epistles, he imitated the younger Pliny; whose rich and florid style he was supposed, by his friends, to equal or excel (Macrob. Saturnal. l. v. c. 1.). But the luxuriancy of Symmachus consists of barren leaves, without fruits, and even without flowers. Few facts, and few sentiments, can be extracted from his verbose correspondence.

the abyss of eternal perdition.[1] Arguments like these, when they were suggested by a favourite bishop, had power to prevent the restoration of the altar of Victory; but the same arguments fell, with much more energy and effect, from the mouth of a conqueror; and the gods of antiquity were dragged in triumph at the chariot-wheels of Theodosius.[2] In a full meeting of the senate, the emperor proposed, according to the forms of the republic, the important question, Whether the worship of Jupiter, or that of Christ, should be the religion of the Romans? The liberty of suffrages, which he affected to allow, was destroyed by the hopes and fears that his presence inspired; and the arbitrary exile of Symmachus was a recent admonition, that it might be dangerous to oppose the wishes of the monarch. On a regular division of the senate, Jupiter was condemned and degraded by the sense of a very large majority; and it is rather surprising, that any members should be found bold enough to declare, by their speeches and votes, that they were still attached to the interest of an abdicated deity.[3] The hasty conversion of the senate must be attributed either to supernatural or to sordid motives; and many of these reluctant proselytes betrayed, on every favourable occasion, their secret disposition to throw aside the mask of odious dissimulation. But they were gradually fixed in the new religion, as the cause of the ancient became more hopeless; they yielded to the authority of the emperor, to the fashion of the times, and to the entreaties of their wives and children,[4] who were instigated and governed by the clergy of Rome and the monks of the East. The edifying example of the Anician family was soon imitated by the rest of the nobility: the Bassi, the Paullini, the Gracchi, embraced the Christian religion; and "the luminaries of the world, the "venerable assembly of Catos (such are the high-flown expressions of "Prudentius), were impatient to strip themselves of their pontifical "garment; to cast the skin of the old serpent; to assume the snowy "robes of baptismal innocence; and to humble the pride of the con-"sular fasces before the tombs of the martyrs."[5] The citizens, who

[1] Ambrose (ii. epist. xvii, xviii. 825.). The former of these epistles is a short caution; the latter is a formal reply to the petition or *libel* of Symmachus. The same ideas are more copiously expressed in the poetry, if it may deserve that name, of Prudentius; who composed his two books against Symmachus (A.D. 404.) while that senator was still alive. It is whimsical enough, that Montesquieu (Consider. &c. c. xix. iii. 487.) should overlook the two professed antagonists of Symmachus; and amuse himself with descanting on the more remote and indirect confutations of Orosius, St. Augustin, and Salvian.

[2] Prudentius (in Symmach. l. i. 545.). The Christian agrees with the Pagan Zosimus (l. iv. 283.), in placing this visit of Theodosius after the *second* civil war, gemini bis victor cæde Tyranni (l. i. 410.). But the time and circumstances are better suited to his first triumph.

[3] Prudentius, after proving that the sense of the senate is declared by a legal majority, proceeds to say (609.),

> Adspice quam pleno subsellia nostra Senatû
> Decernant infame Jovis pulvinar, et omne
> Idolium longe purgatâ ab urbe fugandum.
> Qua vocat egregii sententia Principis, illuc
> Libera, cum pedibus, tum corde, frequentia transit.

Zosimus ascribes to the conscript fathers an heathenish courage, which few of them are found to possess.

[4] Jerom specifies the pontiff Albinus, who was surrounded with such a believing family of children and grandchildren, as would have been sufficient to convert even Jupiter himself; an extraordinary proselyte! (i. ad Lætam, p. 54.).

[5] Exsultare Patres videas, pulcherrima mundi
Lumina; conciliumque senûm gestire Catonum

subsisted by their own industry, and the populace, who were supported by the public liberality, filled the churches of the Lateran, and Vatican, with an incessant throng of devout proselytes. The decrees of the senate, which proscribed the worship of idols, were ratified by the general consent of the Romans:[1] the splendour of the capitol was defaced, and the solitary temples were abandoned to ruin and contempt.[2] Rome submitted to the yoke of the Gospel; and the vanquished provinces had not yet lost their reverence for the name and authority of Rome.

The filial piety of the emperors themselves engaged them to proceed, with some caution and tenderness, in the reformation of the eternal city. Those absolute monarchs acted with less regard to the prejudices of the provincials. The pious labour which had been suspended near twenty years since the death of Constantius,[3] was (A.D. 381) vigorously resumed, and finally accomplished, by the zeal of Theodosius. Whilst that warlike prince yet struggled with the Goths, not for the glory, but for the safety, of the republic; he ventured to offend a considerable party of his subjects, by some acts which might perhaps secure the protection of Heaven, but which must seem rash and unseasonable in the eye of human prudence. The success of his first experiments against the Pagans, encouraged the pious emperor to reiterate and enforce his edicts of proscription; the same laws which had been originally published in the provinces of the East, were applied, after the defeat of Maximus, to the whole extent of the Western empire; and every victory of the orthodox Theodosius contributed to the triumph of the Christian and Catholic faith.—See his *Laws* in *Theod. Code*, l. xvi. tit. x. leg. 7. He attacked superstition in her most vital part, by prohibiting the use of sacrifices, which he declared to be criminal as well as infamous; and if the terms of his edicts more strictly condemned the impious curiosity which examined the entrails of the victims,[4] every subsequent explanation tended to involve, in the same guilt, the general practice of *immolation*, which essentially constituted the religion of the Pagans. As the temples had been erected for the purpose of sacrifice, it was the duty of a benevolent prince to remove from his subjects the dangerous temptation, of offending against the laws which he had enacted. A special commission was granted to Cynegius, the Prætorian præfect of the East, and afterwards to the counts Jovius and Gaudentius, two officers of distinguish-

Candidiore togâ niveum pietatis amictum
Sumere; et exuvias deponere pontificales.

The fancy of Prudentius is warmed and elevated by victory.

[1] Prudentius, after he has described the conversion of the senate and people, asks, with some truth and confidence,

Et dubitamus adhuc Roman, tibi, Christe, dicatam
In leges transisse tuas?

[2] Jerom exults in the desolation of the capitol, and the other temples of Rome tom. (i. p. 54. ii. p. 95.).

[3] Liban. (Orat. pro Templis, p. 10. Genev. 1634. published by James Godefroy, and now extremely scarce) accuses Valentinian and Valens of prohibiting sacrifices. Some partial order may have been issued by the Eastern emperor; but the idea of any general law is contradicted by the silence of the Code, and the evidence of ecclesiastical history.

[4] Homer's sacrifices are not accompanied with any inquisition of entrails (Feithius, Antiq. Homer. l. i. c. 10. 16.). The Tuscans, who produced the first *Haruspices*, subdued both the Greeks and the Romans (Cicero de Divinatione, ii. 23.).

ed rank in the West; by which they were directed to shut the temples, to seize or destroy the instruments of idolatry, to abolish the privileges of the priests, and to confiscate the consecrated property for the benefit of the emperor, of the church, or of the army.[1] Here the desolation might have stopped: and the naked edifices which were no longer employed in the service of idolatry, might have been protected from the destructive rage of fanaticism. Many of those temples were the most splendid and beautiful monuments of Grecian architecture: and the emperor himself was interested not to deface the splendour of his own cities, or to diminish the value of his own possessions. Those stately edifices might be suffered to remain, as so many lasting trophies of the victory of Christ. In the decline of the arts, they might be usefully converted into magazines, manufactories, or places of public assembly· and perhaps, when the walls of the temple had been sufficiently purified by holy rites, the worship of the true Deity might be allowed to expiate the ancient guilt of idolatry. But as long as they subsisted, the Pagans fondly cherished the secret hope, that an auspicious revolution, a second Julian, might again restore the altars of the gods; and the earnestness with which they addressed their unavailing prayers to the throne,[2] increased the zeal of the Christian reformers to extirpate, without mercy, the root of superstition. The laws of the emperor exhibit some symptoms of a milder disposition:[3] but their cold and languid efforts were insufficient to stem the torrent of enthusiasm and rapine, which was conducted, or rather impelled, by the spiritual rulers of the church. In Gaul, the holy Martin, bishop of Tours,[4] marched at the head of his faithful monks, to destroy the idols, the temples, and the consecrated trees of his extensive diocese; and, in the execution of this arduous task, the prudent reader will judge whether Martin was supported by the aid of miraculous powers, or of carnal weapons. In Syria, the divine and excellent Marcellus,[5] as he is styled by Theodoret, a bishop animated with apostolic fervour, resolved to level with the ground the stately temples within the diocese of Apamea. His attack was resisted, by the skill and solidity with which the temple of Jupiter had been constructed. The building was seated on an eminence: on each of the four sides, the lofty roof was supported by 15 massy columns, 16 feet in circumference; and the large stones of which they were composed, were firmly cemented with lead and iron. The force of the strongest and sharpest tools had been tried without effect. It was found necessary to undermine the foundations of the columns, which fell down as soon as the temporary wooden

[1] Zos. l. iv. 245. Theodor. l. v. c. 21. Idatius Chron. Prosper. Aquitan. l. iii. 38. apud Baronium, Annal. Eccles. A.D. 389. No. 52. Liban. (pro Templis, p. 10.) labours to prove, that the commands of Theodosius were not direct and positive.

[2] Cod. Theod. l. xvi. tit. x. leg. 8. 18. There is room to believe, that this temple of Edessa, which Theodosius wished to save for civil uses, was soon afterwards a heap of ruins (Liban. pro Templis, p. 26, and Godefroy's notes, p. 59.).

[3] See this curious oration of Libanius pro Templis, pronounced, or rather composed, about the year 390. I have consulted, with advantage, Lardner's version and remarks (Heath. Testimon. iv. 135.).

[4] Life of Martin, by Sulpic. Sever. c. 9—14. The saint once mistook (as Don Quixote might have done) an harmless funeral for an idolatrous procession, and imprudently committed a miracle.

[5] Compare Soz. (l. vii. c. 15.) with Theodor. (l. v. c. 21.). Between them, they relate the crusade and death of Marcellus.

props had been consumed with fire; and the difficulties of the enterprise are described under the allegory of a black dæmon, who retarded, though he could not defeat, the operations of the Christian engineers. Elated with victory, Marcellus took the field in person against the powers of darkness; a numerous troop of soldiers and gladiators marched under the episcopal banner, and he successively attacked the villages and country temples of the diocese of Apamea. Whenever any resistance or danger was apprehended, the champion of the faith, whose lameness would not allow him either to fight or fly, placed himself at a convenient distance, beyond the reach of darts. But this prudence was the occasion of his death: he was surprised and slain by a body of exasperated rustics; and the synod of the province pronounced, without hesitation, that the holy Marcellus had sacrificed his life in the cause of God. In the support of this cause, the monks, who rushed, with tumultuous fury, from the desert, distinguished themselves by their zeal and diligence. They deserved the enmity of the Pagans; and some of them might deserve the reproaches of avarice and intemperance; of avarice, which they gratified with holy plunder, and of intemperance, which they indulged at the expence of the people, who foolishly admired their tattered garments, loud psalmody, and artificial paleness.[1] A small number of temples was protected by the fears, the venality, the taste, or the prudence, of the civil and ecclesiastical governors. The temple of the celestial Venus at Carthage whose sacred precincts formed a circumference of two miles, was judiciously converted into a Christian church;[2] and a similiar consecration has preserved inviolate the majestic dome of the Pantheon at Rome.[3] But in almost every province of the Roman world, an army of fanatics, without authority, and without discipline, invaded the peaceful inhabitants; and the ruin of the fairest structures of antiquity still displays the ravages of *those* Barbarians, who alone had time and inclination to execute such laborious destruction.

In this wide and various prospect of devastation, the spectator may distinguish the ruins of the temple of Serapis, at Alexandria.[4] Serapis does not appear to have been one of the native gods, or monsters, who sprung from the fruitful soil of superstitious Egypt.[5] The first of the Ptolemies had been commanded, by a dream, to import the mysterious stranger from the coast of Pontus, where he had been long adored by the inhabitants of Sinope; but his attributes and his reign were so imperfectly understood, that it became a subject of dispute, whether he represented the bright orb of day, or the gloomy monarch

[1] Liban. pro Templis, 10—13. He rails at these black-garbled men, the Christian Monks, who eat more than elephants. Poor elephants! *they* are temperate animals.

[2] Prosper Aquitan. l. iii. c. 38. apud Baronium; Annal. Eccles. A.D. 389. No. 58, &c. The temple had been shut some time, and the access to it was overgrown with brambles.

[3] Donatus, Roma Antiqua et Nova, l. iv. c. 4. p. 468. This consecration was performed by pope Boniface IV. I am ignorant of the favourable circumstances which had preserved the Pantheon above 200 years after the reign of Theodosius.

[4] Sophronius composed a recent and separate history (Jerom, Script. Eccles. i. 303.), which had furnished materials to Socr. (l. v. c. 16.), Theodor. (l. v. c. 22.), and Rufinus (l. ii. c. 22.). Yet the last, who had been at Alexandria, before, and after, the event, may deserve the credit of an original witness.

[5] Gerard Vossius (Opera, v. p. 80. and de Idololatria, l. i. c. 29.) strives to support the strange notion of the Fathers; that the patriarch Joseph was adored in Egypt, as the bull Apis, and the god Serapis.

of the subterraneous regions.[1] The Egyptians, who were obstinately devoted to the religion of their fathers, refused to admit this foreign deity within the walls of their cities.[2] But the obsequious priests, who were seduced by the liberality of the Ptolemies, submitted, without resistance, to the power of the god of Pontus: an honourable and domestic genealogy was provided; and this fortunate usurper was introduced into the throne and bed of Osiris,[3] the husband of Isis, and the celestial monarch of Egypt. Alexandria, which claimed his peculiar protection, gloried in the name of the city of Serapis. His temple,[4] which rivalled the pride and magnificence of the capitol, was erected on the spacious summit of an artificial mount, raised one hundred steps above the level of the adjacent parts of the city; and the interior cavity was strongly supported by arches, and distributed into vaults and subterraneous apartments. The consecrated buildings were surrounded by a quadrangular portico; the stately halls, and exquisite statues, displayed the triumph of the arts; and the treasures of ancient learning were preserved in the famous Alexandrian library, which had arisen with new splendour from its ashes.[5] After the edicts of Theodosius had severely prohibited the sacrifices of the Pagans, they were still tolerated in the city and temple of Serapis; and this singular indulgence was imprudently ascribed to the superstitious terrors of the Christians themselves: as if they had feared to abolish those ancient rites, which could alone secure the inundations of the Nile, the harvest of Egypt, and the subsistence of Constantinople.[6]

At that time[7] (A.D. 389) the archiepiscopal throne of Alexandria was filled by Theophilus,[8] the perpetual enemy of peace and virtue; a bold, bad man, whose hands were alternately polluted with gold, and with blood. His pious indignation was excited by the honours of Serapis; and the insults which he offered to an ancient chapel of Bacchus, convinced the Pagans that he meditated a more important and dangerous enterprise. In the tumultuous capital of Egypt, the slightest provocation was sufficient to inflame a civil war. The votaries of Serapis, whose strength and numbers were much inferior to those of their antagonists, rose in arms at the instigation of the philosopher

[1] Origo dei nondum nostris celebrata. Ægyptiorum antistites *sic* memorant, &c. Tacit. Hist. iv. 83. The Greeks, who had travelled into Egypt, were alike ignorant of this new deity.

[2] Macrobius, Saturnal. l. i. c. 7. Such a living fact decisively proves his foreign extraction.

[3] At Rome, Isis and Serapis were united in the same temple. The precedency which the queen assumed may seem to betray her unequal alliance with the stranger of Pontus. But the superiority of the female sex was established in Egypt as a civil and religious institution (Diodor. Sicul. i. l. i. 31. ed. Wessel.), and the same order is observed in Plutarch's Treatise of Isis and *Osiris;* whom he identifies with Serapis.

[4] Ammian. (xxii. 16.). The Expositio totius Mundi (p. 8. Hudson's Geog. Minor, iii.), and Rufinus (l. ii. c. 22.), celebrate the *Serapeum*, as one of the wonders of the world.

[5] Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. ix. 397. The *old* library of the Ptolemies was *totally* consumed in Cæsar's Alexandrian war. Marc Antony gave the whole collection of Pergamus (200,000 volumes) to Cleopatra, as the foundation of the *new* library of Alexandria.

[6] Liban. (pro Templis, p. 21.) indiscreetly provokes his Christian masters by this insulting remark.

[7] We may chuse between the date of Marcellinus (A.D. 389.) or that of Prosper (A.D. 391.). Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 310. 756.) prefers the former, and Pagi the latter.

[8] Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xi. 441. The ambiguous situation of Theophilus, a *saint*, as the friend of Jerom; a *devil*, as the enemy of Chrysostom; produce a sort of impartiality: yet upon the whole, the balance is justly inclined against him.

Olympius,[1] who exhorted them to die in the defence of the altars of the gods. These Pagan fanatics fortified themselves in the temple, or rather fortress, of Serapis; repelled the besiegers by daring sallies, and a resolute defence; and, by the inhuman cruelties which they exercised on their Christian prisoners, obtained the last consolation of despair. The efforts of the prudent magistrate were usefully exerted for the establishment of a truce, till the answer of Theodosius should determine the fate of Serapis. The two parties assembled, without arms, in the principal square; and the Imperial rescript was publicly read. But when a sentence of destruction against the idols of Alexandria was pronounced, the Christians set up a shout of joy and exultation, whilst the unfortunate Pagans, whose fury had given way to consternation, retired with hasty and silent steps, and eluded, by their flight or obscurity, the resentment of their enemies. Theophilus proceeded to demolish the temple of Serapis, without any other difficulties, than those which he found in the weight and solidity of the materials; but these objects proved so insuperable, that he was obliged to leave the foundations; and to content himself with reducing the edifice itself to a heap of rubbish, a part of which was soon afterwards cleared away, to make room for a church, erected in honour of the Christian martyrs. The valuable library of Alexandria was pillaged or destroyed; and, near twenty years afterwards, the appearance of the empty shelves excited the regret and indignation of every spectator, whose mind was not totally darkened by religious prejudice.[2] The compositions of ancient genius, so many of which have irretrievably perished, might surely have been excepted from the wreck of idolatry, for the amusement and instruction of succeeding ages; and either the zeal or the avarice of the archbishop,[3] might have been satiated with the rich spoils, which were the reward of his victory. While the images and vases of gold and silver were carefully melted, and those of a less valuable metal were contemptuously broken, and cast into the streets, Theophilus laboured to expose the frauds and vices of the ministers of the idols; their dexterity in the management of the loadstone; their secret methods of introducing an human actor into a hollow statue; and their scandalous abuse of the confidence of devout husbands, and unsuspecting females.[4] Charges like these may seem to deserve some degree of credit, as they are not repugnant to the crafty and interested spirit of superstition. But the same spirit is equally prone to the base practice of insulting and calumniating a

[1] Lardner (Heath. Testimon. iv. 411.) has alleged a beautiful passage from Suidas, or rather from Damascius, which shows the devout and virtuous Olympius, not in the light of a warrior, but of a prophet.

[2] Nos vidimus armaria librorum, quibus direptis, exinanita ea a nostris hominibus, nostris temporibus memorant. Oros. l. vi. c. 15. p. 421. ed. Havercamp. Though a bigot, and a controversial writer, Orosius seems to blush.

[3] Eunapius, in the Lives of Antoninus and Ædesius, execrates the sacrilegious rapine of Theophilus. Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. xiii. 453.) quotes an epistle of Isidore of Pelusium, which reproaches the primate with the *idolatrous* worship of gold, the auri *sacra* fames.

[4] Rufinus names the priest of Saturn, who, in the character of the god, familiarly conversed with many pious ladies of quality; till he betrayed himself, in a moment of transport, when he could not disguise the tone of his voice. The authentic and impartial narrative of Æschines (Bayle, Diction. Crit. SCAMANDRE), and the adventure of Mundus (Joseph. Antiq. Jud. l. xviii. c. 3. p. 877. ed. Havercamp.), may prove that such amorous frauds have been practised with success.

fallen enemy; and our belief is naturally checked by the reflection, that it is much less difficult to invent a fictitious story, than to support a practical fraud. The colossal statue of Serapis[1] was involved in the ruin of his temple and religion. A great number of plates of different metals, artificially joined together, composed the majestic figure of the deity, who touched on either side the walls of the sanctuary. The aspect of Serapis, his sitting posture, and the sceptre, which he bore in his left hand, were extremely similar to the ordinary representations of Jupiter. He was distinguished from Jupiter by the basket, or bushel, which was placed on his head; and by the emblematic monster, which he held in his right hand: the head and body of a serpent branching into three tails, which were again terminated by the triple heads of a dog, a lion, and a wolf. It was confidently affirmed, that if any impious hand should dare to violate the majesty of the god, the heavens and the earth would instantly return to their original chaos. An intrepid soldier, animated by zeal, and armed with a weighty battle-axe, ascended the ladder; and even the Christian multitude expected, with some anxiety, the event of the combat.[2] He aimed a vigorous stroke against the cheek of Serapis; the cheek fell to the ground; the thunder was still silent, and both the heavens and the earth continued to preserve their accustomed order and tranquillity. The victorious soldier repeated his blows: the huge idol was overthrown, and broken in pieces: and the limbs of Serapis were ignominiously dragged through the streets of Alexandria. His mangled carcase was burnt in the Amphitheatre, amidst the shouts of the populace; and many persons attributed their conversion to this discovery of the impotence of their tutelar deity. The popular modes of religion, that propose any visible and material objects of worship, have the advantage of adapting and familiarizing themselves to the senses of mankind: but this advantage is counterbalanced by the various and inevitable accidents to which the faith of the idolater is exposed. It is scarcely possible, that, in every disposition of mind, he should preserve his implicit reverence for the idols, or the relics, which the naked eye, and the profane hand, are unable to distinguish from the most common productions of art, or nature; and if, in the hour of danger, their secret and miraculous virtue does not operate for their own preservation, he scorns the vain apologies of his priests, and justly derides the object and the folly of his superstitious attachment.[3] After the fall of Serapis, some hopes were still entertained by the Pagans, that the Nile would refuse his annual supply to the impious masters of Egypt; and the extraordinary delay of the inundation seemed to announce the displeasure of the river-god. But this delay was soon compensated by

[1] Images of Serapis, in Montfaucon (ii. 297.): but the description of Macrobius (Saturnal. l. i. c. 20.) is much more picturesque and satisfactory.

[2] Sed fortes tremuere manus, motique verendâ
Majestate loci, si robora sacra ferirent
In sua credebant redituras membra secures.

(Lucan. iii. 429.) "Is it true (said Augustus to a veteran of Italy, at whose house he supped), "that the man, who gave the first blow to the golden statue at Anaitas, was instantly deprived "of his eyes, and of his life?" "*I* was that man (replied the clear-sighted veteran), and you "now sup on one of the legs of the goddess." (Plin. Hist. Natur. xxxiii. 24.)

[3] The History of the Reformation affords frequent examples of the sudden change from superstition to contempt.

the rapid swell of the waters. They suddenly rose to such an unusual height, as to comfort the discontented party with the pleasing expectation of a deluge; till the peaceful river again subsided to the well-known and fertilizing level of 16 cubits, or about 30 English feet.[1]

The temples of the Roman empire were deserted, or destroyed; but the ingenious superstition of the Pagans still attempted to elude the laws (A.D. 390) of Theodosius, by which all sacrifices had been severely prohibited. The inhabitants of the country, whose conduct was less exposed to the eye of malicious curiosity, disguised their *religious*, under the appearance of *convivial*, meetings. On the days of solemn festivals, they assembled in great numbers under the spreading shade of some consecrated trees; sheep and oxen were slaughtered and roasted; and this rural entertainment was sanctified by the use of incense, and by the hymns, which were sung in honour of the gods. But it was alleged, that, as no part of the animal was made a burnt-offering, as no altar was provided to receive the blood, and as the previous oblation of salt cakes, and the concluding ceremony of libations, were carefully omitted, these festal meetings did not involve the guests in the guilt, or penalty, of an illegal sacrifice.[2] Whatever might be the truth of the facts, or the merit of the distinction,[3] these vain pretences were swept away by the last edict of Theodosius; which inflicted a deadly wound on the superstition of the Pagans.[4] This prohibitory law is expressed in the most absolute and comprehensive terms. "It is our will and pleasure," says the emperor, "that none of "our subjects, whether magistrates or private citizens, however exalted "or however humble may be their rank and condition, shall presume, "in any city, or in any place, to worship an inanimate idol, by the "sacrifice of a guiltless victim." The act of sacrificing, and the practice of divination by the entrails of the victim, are declared (without any regard to the object of the enquiry) a crime of high-treason against the state; which can be expiated only by the death of the guilty. The rites of Pagan superstition, which might seem less bloody and atrocious, are abolished, as highly injurious to the truth and honour of religion; luminaries, garlands, frankincense, and libations of wine, are specially enumerated and condemned; and the harmless claims of the domestic genius, of the household gods, are included in this rigorous proscription. The use of any of these profane and illegal ceremonies, subjects the offender to the forfeiture of the house, or estate, where they have been performed; and if he has artfully chosen the property of another for the scene of his impiety, he is compelled to discharge, without delay, a heavy fine of 25 pounds of gold, or more than £1000. A fine, not less considerable, is imposed on the connivance of the secret

[1] Soz. l. vii. c. 20. I have supplied the measure. The same standard, of the inundation, and consequently of the cubit, has uniformly subsisted since the time of Herodotus. Freret, in the Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. xvi. 344—353. Greaves's Miscellan. Works, i. 233. The Egyptian cubit is about 22 inches of the English measure.

[2] Liban. (pro Templis, p. 15.) pleads their cause with gentle and insinuating rhetoric. From the earliest age, such feasts had enlivened the country; and those of Bacchus (Georgic ii. 380.) had produced the theatre of Athens. Godefroy, ad loc. Liban. and Codex Theod. vi. 284.

[3] Honorius tolerated these rustic festivals (A.D. 399.). "Absque ullo sacrificio, atque ullâ superstitione damnabili." But nine years afterwards he found it necessary to reiterate and enforce the same proviso (Cod. Theod. l. xvi. tit. x. leg. 17. 19.).

[4] Cod. Theod. l. xvi. tit. x. leg. 12. Jortin (On Eccles. Hist. iv. 134.) censures, with becoming asperity, the style and sentiments of this intolerant law.

enemies of religion, who shall neglect the duty of their respective stations, either to reveal, or to punish, the guilt of idolatry. Such was the persecuting spirit of the laws of Theodosius, which were repeatedly enforced by his sons and grandsons, with the loud and unanimous applause of the Christian world.[1]

In the cruel reigns of Decius and Diocletian, Christianity had been proscribed, as a revolt from the ancient and hereditary religion of the empire; and the unjust suspicions which were entertained of a dark and dangerous faction, were, in some measure, countenanced by the inseparable union, and rapid conquests, of the Catholic church. But the same excuses of fear and ignorance cannot be applied to the Christian emperors, who violated the precepts of humanity and of the gospel. The experience of ages had betrayed the weakness, as well as folly, of Paganism; the light of reason and of faith had already exposed, to the greatest part of mankind, the vanity of idols; and the declining sect, which still adhered to their worship, might have been permitted to enjoy, in peace and obscurity, the religious customs of their ancestors. Had the Pagans been animated by the undaunted zeal, which possessed the minds of the primitive believers, the triumph of the church must have been stained with blood; and the martyrs of Jupiter and Apollo might have embraced the glorious opportunity of devoting their lives and fortunes at the foot of their altars. But such obstinate zeal was not congenial to the loose and careless temper of polytheism. The violent and repeated strokes of the orthodox princes were broken by the soft and yielding substance against which they were directed; and the ready obedience of the Pagans protected them from the pains and penalties of the Theodosian Code.[2] Instead of asserting, that the authority of the gods was superior to that of the emperor, they desisted, with a plaintive murmur, from the use of those sacred rites which their sovereign had condemned. If they were sometimes tempted, by a sally of passion, or by the hopes of concealment, to indulge their favourite superstition; their humble repentance disarmed the severity of the Christian magistrate, and they seldom refused to atone for their rashness, by submitting, with some secret reluctance, to the yoke of the Gospel. The churches were filled with the increasing multitude of these unworthy proselytes, who had conformed, from temporal motives, to the reigning religion; and whilst they devoutly imitated the postures, and recited the prayers, of the faithful, they satisfied their conscience by the silent and sincere invocation of the gods of antiquity.[3] If the Pagans wanted patience to suffer, they wanted spirit to resist; and the scattered myriads, who deplored the ruin of the temples, yielded, without a contest, to the

[1] Such a charge should not be lightly made; but it may surely be justified by the authority of St. Augustin, who thus addresses the Donatists. "Quis nostrûm, quis vestrûm non laudat "leges ab Imperatoribus datas adversus sacrificia Paganorum? Et certe longe ibi pœna "severior constituta est; illius quippe impietatis capitale supplicium est." Epist. xciii. No. 10. quoted by Le Clerc (Biblio. Choisie, viii. 277.), who adds some judicious reflections on the intolerance of the victorious Christians.

[2] Oros. l. vii. c. 28. p. 537. Aug. (Enarrat. Psalm cxl. apud Lardner, Heath. Testim. iv. 458.) insults their cowardice. "Quis eorum comprehensus est in sacrificio (cum his legibus ista prohiberentur) et non negavit?"

[3] Liban. (pro Templis, p. 17.) mentions, without censure, the occasional conformity, and as it were theatrical play, of these hypocrites.

fortune of their adversaries. The disorderly opposition [1] of the peasants of Syria, and the populace of Alexandria, to the rage of private fanaticism, was silenced by the name and authority of the emperor. The Pagans of the West, without contributing to the elevation of Eugenius, disgraced, by their partial attachment, the cause and character of the usurper. The clergy vehemently exclaimed, that he aggravated the crime of rebellion by the guilt of apostacy; that, by his permission, the altar of Victory was again restored; and that the idolatrous symbols of Jupiter and Hercules were displayed in the field, against the invincible standard of the cross. But the vain hopes of the Pagans were soon annihilated by the defeat of Eugenius; and they were left exposed to the resentment of the conqueror, who laboured to deserve the favour of Heaven by the extirpation of idolatry.[2]

A nation of slaves is always prepared to applaud the clemency of their master, who, in the abuse of absolute power, does not proceed to the last extremes of injustice and oppression. Theodosius might undoubtedly have proposed to his Pagan subjects the alternative of baptism or of death; and the eloquent Libanius has praised the moderation of a prince, who never enacted, by any positive law, that all his subjects should immediately embrace and practise the religion of their sovereign.[3] The profession of Christianity was not made an essential qualification for the enjoyment of the civil rights of society, nor were any peculiar hardships imposed on the sectaries who credulously received the fables of Ovid, and obstinately rejected the miracles of the Gospel. The palace, the schools, the army, and the senate, were filled with declared and devout Pagans; they obtained, without distinction, the civil and military honours of the empire. Theodosius distinguished his liberal regard for virtue and genius, by the consular dignity which he bestowed on Symmachus;[4] and by the personal friendship which he expressed to Libanius;[5] and the two eloquent apologists of Paganism were never required either to change, or to dissemble, their religious opinions. The Pagans were indulged in the most licentious freedom of speech and writing; the historical and philosophic remains of Eunapius, Zosimus,[6] and the fanatic teachers of the school of Plato, betray the most furious animosity, and contain the sharpest invectives, against the sentiments and conduct of their vic-

[1] Libanius concludes his apology (p. 32.), by declaring to the emperor, that unless he expressly warrants the destruction of the temples, ισθι τους των αγρων δεσποτας, και αυτοις, και τῳ νομῳ βιηθησοντας, the proprietors will defend themselves and the laws.

[2] Paulin. Vit. Ambros. c. 26. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. v. c. 26. Theod. l. v. c. 24.

[3] Libanius suggests the form of a persecuting edict, which Theodosius might enact (pro Templis, p. 32.); a rash joke, and a dangerous experiment. Some princes would have taken his advice.

[4] Denique pro meritis terrestribus æque rependens
Munera, sacricolis summos impertit honores.
* * * * * *
Ipse magistratum tibi consulis, ipse tribunal
Contulit. Prudent. Symmach. l. 617, &c.

[5] Liban. (pro Templis, p. 32.) is proud that Theodosius should thus distinguish a man, who even in his *presence* would swear by Jupiter. Yet this presence seems to be no more than a figure of rhetoric.

[6] Zosimus, who styles himself Count and Ex-advocate of the Treasury, reviles, with partial and indecent bigotry, the Christian princes, and even the father of his sovereign. His work must have been privately circulated, since it escaped the invectives of the ecclesiastical historians prior to Evagrius (l. iii. c. 40.) who lived towards the end of the sixth century

torious adversaries. If these audacious libels were publicly known, we must applaud the good sense of the Christian princes, who viewed, with a smile of contempt, the last struggles of superstition and despair.[1] But the Imperial laws, which prohibited the sacrifices and ceremonies of Paganism, were rigidly executed; and every hour contributed to destroy the influence of a religion, which was supported by custom, rather than by argument. The devotion of the poet, or the philosopher, may be secretly nourished by prayer, meditation, and study; but the exercise of public worship appears to be the only solid foundation of the religious sentiments of the people, which derive their force from imitation and habit. The interruption of that public exercise may consummate, in the period of a few years, the important work of a national revolution. The memory of theological opinions cannot long be preserved, without the artificial helps of priests, of temples, and of books.[2] The ignorant vulgar, whose minds are still agitated by the blind hopes and terrors of superstition, will be soon persuaded by their superiors, to direct their vows to the reigning deities of the age; and will insensibly imbibe an ardent zeal for the support and propagation of the new doctrine, which spiritual hunger at first compelled them to accept. The generation that arose (A.D. 390—420) in the world after the promulgation of the Imperial laws, was attracted within the pale of the Catholic church; and so rapid, yet so gentle, was the fall of Paganism, that only twenty-eight years after the death of Theodosius, the faint and minute vestiges were no longer visible to the eye of the legislator.[3]

The ruin of the Pagan religion is described by the sophists, as a dreadful and amazing prodigy, which covered the earth with darkness, and restored the ancient dominion of chaos and of night. They relate, in solemn and pathetic strains, that the temples were converted into sepulchres, and that the holy places, which had been adorned by the statues of the gods, were basely polluted by the relics of Christian martyrs. "The monks" (a race of filthy animals, to whom Eunapius is tempted to refuse the name of men) "are the authors of the new "worship, which, in the place of those deities, who are conceived by "the understanding, has substituted the meanest and most con- "temptible slaves. The heads, salted and pickled, of those infamous "malefactors, who for the multitude of their crimes have suffered a "just and ignominious death; their bodies, still marked by the im- "pression of the lash, and the scars of those tortures which were "inflicted by the sentence of the magistrate; such" (continues Eunapius) "are the gods which the earth produces in our days; such are the "martyrs, the supreme arbitrators of our prayers and petitions to the "Deity, whose tombs are now consecrated as the objects of the vener-

[1] Yet the Pagans of Africa complained, that the times would not allow them to answer with freedom the City of God; nor does St. August. (v. 26.) deny the charge.

[2] The Moors of Spain, who secretly preserved the Mahometan religion, above a century, under the tyranny of the Inquisition, possessed the Koran, with the peculiar use of the Arabic tongue. See the curious and honest story of their expulsion in Geddes (Miscellan. i. 1—198.).

[3] Paganos qui supersunt, quanquam jam nullos esse credamus, &c. Cod. Theod. l. xvi. tit. x. leg. 22. A.D. 423. The younger Theodosius was afterwards satisfied that his judgment had been somewhat premature.

"ation of the people."[1] Without approving the malice, it is natural enough to share the surprise, of the Sophist, the spectator of a revolution, which raised those obscure victims of the laws of Rome, to the rank of celestial and invisible protectors of the Roman empire. The grateful respect of the Christians for the martyrs of the faith, was exalted by time and victory into religious adoration; and the most illustrious of the saints and prophets were deservedly associated to the honours of the martyrs. One hundred and fifty years after the glorious deaths of St. Peter and St. Paul, the Vatican and the Ostian road were distinguished by the tombs, or rather by the trophies, of those spiritual heroes.[2] In the age which followed the conversion of Constantine, the emperors, the consuls, and the generals of armies, devoutly visited the sepulchres of a tent-maker and a fisherman;[3] and their venerable bones were deposited under the altars of Christ, on which the bishops of the royal city continually offered the unbloody sacrifice.[4] The new capital of the eastern world, unable to produce any ancient and domestic trophies, was enriched by the spoils of dependent provinces. The bodies of St. Andrew, St. Luke, and St. Timothy, had reposed, near 300 years, in the obscure graves, from whence they were transported, in solemn pomp, to the church of the Apostles, which the magnificence of Constantine had founded on the banks of the Thracian Bosphorus.[5] About 50 years afterwards, the same banks were honoured by the presence of Samuel, the judge and prophet of the people of Israel. His ashes, deposited in a golden vase, and covered with a silken veil, were delivered by the bishops into each other's hands. The relics of Samuel were received by the people, with the same joy and reverence which they would have shown to the living prophet; the highways, from Palestine to the gates of Constantinople, were filled with an uninterrupted procession; and the emperor Arcadius himself, at the head of the most illustrious members of the clergy and senate, advanced to meet his extraordinary guest, who had always deserved and claimed the homage of kings.[6] The example of Rome and Constantinople confirmed the faith and discipline of the Catholic world. The honours of the saints and martyrs, after a feeble and ineffectual murmur of profane reason,[7] were universally established;

[1] Eunap. in his Life of the sophist Ædesius; in that of Eustathius he foretells the ruin of Paganism, *και τι μυθωδες, και αειδες σκοτος τυραννησει τα επι γης καλλιστα.*

[2] Caius (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. ii. c. 25.), a Roman presbyter, who lived in the time of Zephyrinus (A.D. 202—219.), is an early witness of this superstitious practice.

[3] Chrysost. Quod Christus sit Deus, i. nov. edit. No. 9. I am indebted for this quotation to Benedict the XIVth's pastoral letter on the jubilee of the year 1750. See the curious and entertaining letters of M. Chais, iii.

[4] Male facit ergo Romanus episcopus? qui, super mortuorum hominum, Petri et Pauli, secundum nos, ossa veneranda . . . . offert Domino sacrificia, et tumulos eorum, Christi arbitratur altaria. Jerom. ii. advers. Vigilant. p. 153.

[5] Jerom (ii. 122. (bears witness to these translations, which are neglected by the ecclesiastical historians. The passion of St. Andrew at Patræ, is described in an epistle from the clergy of Achaia, which Baronius (Annal. Eccles. A.D. 60. No. 34. wishes to believe, and Tillemont is forced to reject. St. Andrew was adopted as the spiritual founder of Constantinople (Mem. Eccles. i. 317. 588.).

[6] Jerom (ii. 122.) pompously describes the translation of Samuel, which is noticed in all the chronicles of the times.

[7] The presbyter Vigilantius, the Protestant of his age, firmly, though ineffectually, withstood the superstition of monks, relics, saints, fasts, &c. for which Jerom compares him to the Hydra, Cerberus, the Centaurs, &c. and considers him only as the organ of the dæmon (ii. 120.). Whoever will peruse the controversy of St. Jerom and Vigilantius, and St. Augustin's account of the miracles of St. Stephen, may speedily gain some idea of the spirit of the fathers.

and in the age of Ambrose and Jerom, something was still deemed wanting to the sanctity of a Christian church, till it had been consecrated by some portion of holy relics, which fixed and inflamed the devotion of the faithful.

In the long period of twelve hundred years, which elapsed between the reign of Constantine and the reformation of Luther, the worship of saints and relics corrupted the pure and perfect simplicity of the Christian model; and some symptoms of degeneracy may be observed even in the first generations which adopted and cherished this pernicious innovation.

I. The satisfactory experience, that the relics of saints were more valuable than gold or precious stones,[1] stimulated the clergy to multiply the treasures of the church. Without much regard for truth or probability, they invented names for skeletons, and actions for names. The fame of the apostles, and of the holy men who had imitated their virtues, was darkened by religious fiction. To the invincible band of genuine and primitive martyrs, they added myriads of imaginary heroes, who had never existed, except in the fancy of crafty or credulous legendaries; and there is reason to suspect, that Tours might not be the only diocese in which the bones of a malefactor were adored, instead of those of a saint.[2] A superstitious practice, which tended to increase the temptations of fraud and credulity, insensibly extinguished the light of history, and of reason, in the Christian world.

II. But the progress of superstition would have been much less rapid and victorious, if the faith of the people had not been assisted by the seasonable aid of visions and miracles, to ascertain the authenticity and virtue of the most suspicious relics. In the reign of the younger Theodosius, Lucian,[3] a presbyter of Jerusalem, and the ecclesiastical minister of the village of Caphargamala, about twenty miles from the city, related a very singular dream, which, to remove his doubts, had been repeated on three successive Saturdays. A venerable figure stood before him, in the silence of the night, with a long beard, a white robe, and a gold rod; announced himself by the name of Gamaliel, and revealed to the astonished presbyter, that his own corpse, with the bodies of his son Abibas, his friend Nicodemus, and the illustrious Stephen, the first martyr of the Christian faith, were secretly buried in the adjacent field. He added, with some impatience, that it was time to release himself, and his companions, from their obscure prison; that their appearance would be salutary to a distressed world; and that they had made choice of Lucian to inform the bishop of Jerusalem of their situation, and their wishes. The doubts and difficulties which still retarded this important dis-

[1] M. de Beausobre (Hist. du Manich. ii. 648.) has applied a worldly sense to the pious observation of the clergy of Smyrna, who carefully preserved the relics of St. Polycarp the martyr.

[2] Martin of Tours (Life, c. 8. by Sulpic. Sever.) extorted this confession from the mouth of the dead man. The error is allowed to be natural; the discovery is supposed to be miraculous. Which of the two was likely to happen most frequently?

[3] Lucian composed in Greek his original narrative, which has been translated by Avitus, and published by Baronius (Annal. Eccles. A.D. 415. No. 7—16.). The Benedict. editors of St. August. have given (at the end of the work de Civ. Dei) two several copies, with many various readings. It is the character of falsehood to be loose and inconsistent. The most incredible parts of the legend are smoothed and softened by Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. ii. 9.).

covery, were successively removed by new visions: and the ground was opened by the bishop, in the presence of an innumerable multitude. The coffins of Gamaliel, of his son, and of his friend, were found in regular order; but when the fourth coffin, which contained the remains of Stephen, was shown to the light, the earth trembled, and an odour, such as that of paradise, was smelt, which instantly cured the various diseases of seventy-three of the assistants. The companions of Stephen were left in their peaceful residence of Caphargamala: but the relics of the first martyr were transported, in solemn procession, to a church constructed in their honour on Mount Sion; and the minute particles of those relics, a drop of blood,[1] or the scrapings of a bone, were acknowledged, in almost every province of the Roman world, to possess a divine and miraculous virtue. The grave and learned Augustin,[2] whose understanding scarcely admits the excuse of credulity, has attested the innumerable prodigies which were performed in Africa by the relics of St. Stephen; and this marvellous narrative is inserted in the elaborate work of the City of God, which the bishop of Hippo designed as a solid and immortal proof of the truth of Christianity. Augustin solemnly declares, that he has selected those miracles only which were publicly certified by the persons who were either the objects, or the spectators, of the power of the martyr. Many prodigies were omitted, or forgotten; and Hippo had been less favourably treated than the other cities of the province. And yet the bishop enumerates above seventy miracles, of which three were resurrections from the dead, in the space of two years, and within the limits of his own diocese.[3] If we enlarge our view to all the dioceses, and all the saints, of the Christian world, it will not be easy to calculate the fables, and the errors, which issued from this inexhaustible source. But we may surely be allowed to observe, that a miracle, in that age of superstition and credulity, lost its name and its merit, since it could scarcely be considered as a deviation from the ordinary, and established, laws of nature.

III. The innumerable miracles, of which the tombs of the martyrs were the perpetual theatre, revealed to the pious believer the actual state and constitution of the invisible world; and his religious speculations appeared to be founded on the firm basis of fact and experience. Whatever might be the condition of vulgar souls, in the long interval between the dissolution and the resurrection of their bodies, it was evident that the superior spirits of the saints and martyrs did not consume that portion of their existence in silent and inglorious sleep.[5] It was evident (without presuming to determine the

[1] A phial of St. Stephen's blood was annually liquefied at Naples, till he was superseded by St. Januarius (Ruinart. Hist. Persecut. Vandal. p. 529.).

[2] Augustin composed the two-and-twenty books de Civ. Dei in the space of 13 years, A.D. 413—426 (Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xiv. 608.). His learning is too often borrowed, and his arguments are too often his own; but the whole work claims the merit of a magnificent design, vigorously, and not unskilfully, executed.

[3] Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. xxii. c. 22. and the Appendix, which contains two books of St. Stephen's miracles, by Evodius, bishop of Uzalis. Freculphus (apud Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, viii. 249.) has preserved a Gallic or Spanish proverb, "Whoever pretends to have read all the "miracles of St. Stephen, he lies."

[4] Burnet (de Statû Mortuorum, p. 56—84.) collects the opinions of the Fathers, as far as they assert the sleep, or repose, of human souls till the day of judgment. He afterwards ex-

place of their habitation, or the nature of their felicity) that they enjoyed the lively and active consciousness of their happiness, their virtue, and their powers; and that they had already secured the possession of their eternal reward. The enlargement of their intellectual faculties surpassed the measure of the human imagination; since it was proved by *experience*, that they were capable of hearing and understanding the various petitions of their numerous votaries; who, in the same moment of time, but in the most distant parts of the world, invoked the name and assistance of Stephen or of Martin.[1] The confidence of their petitioners was founded on the persuasion, that the saints, who reigned with Christ, cast an eye of pity upon earth; that they were warmly interested in the prosperity of the Catholic church; and that the individuals, who imitated the example of their faith and piety, were the peculiar and favourite objects of their most tender regard. Sometimes, indeed, their friendship might be influenced by considerations of a less exalted kind: they viewed, with partial affection, the places which had been consecrated by their birth, their residence, their death, their burial, or the possession of their relics. The meaner passions of pride, avarice, and revenge, may be deemed unworthy of a celestial breast; yet the saints themselves condescended to testify their grateful approbation of the liberality of their votaries: and the sharpest bolts of punishment were hurled against those impious wretches, who violated their magnificent shrines, or disbelieved their supernatural power.—*Fleury*, *Discours sur l'Hist. Eccles.* iii. 80. Atrocious, indeed, must have been the guilt, and strange would have been the scepticism, of those men, if they had obstinately resisted the proofs of a divine agency, which the elements, the whole range of the animal creation, and even the subtle and invisible operations of the human mind, were compelled to obey.[2] The immediate, and almost instantaneous, effects, that were supposed to follow the prayer, or the offence, satisfied the Christians, of the ample measure of favour and authority, which the saints enjoyed in the presence of the Supreme God; and it seemed almost superfluous to enquire, whether they were continually obliged to intercede before the throne of grace; or whether they might not be permitted to exercise, according to the dictates of their benevolence and justice, the delegated powers of their subordinate ministry. The imagination, which had been raised by a painful effort to the contemplation and worship of the Universal Cause, eagerly embraced such inferior objects of adoration, as were more proportioned to its gross conceptions and imperfect faculties. The sublime and simple theology of

poses (p. 91, &c.) the inconveniences which must arise, if they possessed a more active and sensible existence.

[1] Vigilantius placed the souls of the prophets and martyrs, either in the bosom of Abraham (in loco refrigerii), or else under the altar of God. Nec posse suis tumulis et ubi voluerunt adesse præsentes. But Jerom (ii. 122.) sternly refutes this *blasphemy*. Tu Deo leges pones? Tu apostolis vincula injicies, ut usque ad diem judicii teneantur custodiâ, nec sint cum Domino suo; de quibus scriptum est, Sequuntur Agnum quocunque vadit. Si Agnus ubique, ergo, et hi, qui cum Agno sunt, ubique esse credendi sunt. Et cum diabolus et dæmones toto vagentur in orbe, &c.

[2] At Minorca, the relics of St. Stephen converted, in eight days, 540 Jews; with the help, indeed, of some wholesome severities, such as burning the synagogue, driving the obstinate infidels to starve among the rocks, &c. See the original letter of Severus bishop of Minorca (ad calcem St. Aug. de Civ. Dei), and the judicious remarks of Basnage (viii. 245.).

the primitive Christians was gradually corrupted; and the MONARCHY of heaven, already clouded by metaphysical subtleties, was degraded by the introduction of a popular mythology, which tended to restore the reign of polytheism.[1]

IV. As the objects of religion were gradually reduced to the standard of the imagination, the rites and ceremonies were introduced that seemed most powerfully to affect the senses of the vulgar. If, in the beginning of the fifth century,[2] Tertullian, or Lactantius,[3] had been suddenly raised from the dead, to assist at the festival of some popular saint, or martyr;[4] they would have gazed with astonishment, and indignation, on the profane spectacle, which had succeeded to the pure and spiritual worship of a Christian congregation. As soon as the doors of the church were thrown open, they must have been offended by the smoke of incense, the perfume of flowers, and the glare of lamps and tapers, which diffused, at noon-day, a gawdy, superfluous, and, in their opinion, a sacrilegious light. If they approached the balustrade of the altar, they made their way through the prostrate crowd, consisting, for the most part, of strangers and pilgrims, who resorted to the city on the vigil of the feast; and who already felt the strong intoxication of fanaticism, and, perhaps, of wine. Their devout kisses were imprinted on the walls and pavement of the sacred edifice; and their fervent prayers were directed, whatever might be the language of their church, to the bones, the blood, or the ashes of the saint, which were usually concealed, by a linen or silken veil, from the eyes of the vulgar. The Christians frequented the tombs of the martyrs, in the hope of obtaining, from their powerful intercession, every sort of spiritual, but more especially of temporal, blessings. They implored the preservation of their health, or the cure of their infirmities; the fruitfulness of their barren wives, or the safety and happiness of their children. Whenever they undertook any distant or dangerous journey, they requested, that the holy martyrs would be their guides and protectors on the road; and if they returned, without having experienced any misfortune, they again hastened to the tombs of the martyrs, to celebrate, with grateful thanksgivings, their obligations to the memory and relics of those heavenly patrons. The walls were hung round with symbols of the favours, which they had received; eyes, and hands, and feet, of gold and silver: and edifying pictures, which could not long escape the abuse of indiscreet or idolatrous devotion, represented the image, the attributes, and the miracles of the tutelar saint. The same uniform original spirit of superstition might suggest, in the most

[1]. Hume (Essays, ii. 434.) observes, like a philosopher, the natural flux and reflux of polytheism and theism.

[2] D'Aubigné (Mem. p. 156.) frankly offered, with the consent of the Huguenot ministers, to allow the first 400 years as the rule of faith. The cardinal du Perron haggled for 40 years more, which were indiscreetly given. Yet neither party would have found their account in this foolish bargain.

[3] The worship practised and inculcated by Tertull. Lactan., Arnobius, &c. is so *extremely* pure and spiritual, that their declamations against the Pagan, sometimes glance against the Jewish, ceremonies.

[4] Faustus the Manichæan accuses the Catholics of idolatry. Vertitis idola in martyres . . . quos votis similibus colitis. M. de Beausobre (Hist. Crit. du Manich. ii. 629.), a Protestant, but a philosopher, has represented, with candour and learning, the introduction of *Christian idolatry* in the fourth and fifth centuries.

distant ages and countries, the same methods of deceiving the credulity, and of affecting the senses, of mankind:[1] but it must ingenuously be confessed, that the ministers of the Catholic church imitated the profane model, which they were impatient to destroy. The most respectable bishops had persuaded themselves, that the ignorant rustics would more cheerfully renounce the superstitions of Paganism, if they found some resemblance, some compensation, in the bosom of Christianity. The religion of Constantine achieved, in less than a century, the final conquest of the Roman empire: but the victors themselves were insensibly subdued by the arts of their vanquished rivals.[2]

CHAPTER XXIX.

Final Division of the Roman Empire between the Sons of Theodosius.—Reign of Arcadius and Honorius.—Administration of Rufinus and Stilicho.—Revolt and Defeat of Gildo in Africa.

THE genius of Rome expired with Theodosius; the last of the successors of Augustus and Constantine, who appeared in the field at the head of their armies, and whose authority was universally acknowledged throughout the whole extent of the empire. The memory of his virtues still continued, however, to protect the feeble and inexperienced youth of his two sons. After the death (A.D. 395, Jan. 17) of their father, Arcadius and Honorius were saluted, by the unanimous consent of mankind, as the lawful emperors of the East, and of the West; and the oath of fidelity was eagerly taken by every order of the state; the senates of old and new Rome, the clergy, the magistrates, the soldiers, and the people. Arcadius, who then was about eighteen years of age, was born in Spain, in the humble habitation of a private family. But he received a princely education in the palace of Constantinople; and his inglorious life was spent in that peaceful and splendid seat of royalty, from whence he appeared to reign over the provinces of Thrace, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, from the Lower Danube to the confines of Persia and Æthiopia. His younger brother, Honorius, assumed, in the eleventh year of his age, the nominal government of Italy, Africa, Gaul, Spain, and Britain; and the troops, which guarded the frontiers of his kingdom, were opposed, on one side, to the Caledonians, and on the other to the Moors. The great and martial præfecture of Illyricum was divided between the two princes; the defence and possession of the provinces of Noricum, Pannonia, and Dalmatia, still belonged to the western empire; but the

[1] The resemblance of superstition, which could not be imitated, might be traced from Japan to Mexico. Warburton has seized this idea, which he distorts, by rendering it too general and absolute (Div. Legation, iv. 126.).

[2] The imitation of Paganism is the subject of Middleton's agreeable letter from Rome. Warburton's animadversions obliged him to connect (iii. 120.) the history of the two religions; and to prove the antiquity of the Christian copy.

two large dioceses of Dacia and Macedonia, which Gratian had entrusted to the valour of Theodosius, were for ever united to the empire of the East. The boundary in Europe was not very different from the line which now separates the Germans and the Turks; and the respective advantages of territory, riches, populousness, and military strength, were fairly balanced and compensated, in this final and permanent division of the Roman empire. The hereditary sceptre of the sons of Theodosius appeared to be the gift of nature, and of their father; the generals and ministers had been accustomed to adore the majesty of the royal infants; and the army and people were not admonished of their rights, and of their power, by the dangerous example of a recent election. The gradual discovery of the weakness of Arcadius and Honorius, and the repeated calamities of their reign, were not sufficient to obliterate the deep and early impressions of loyalty. The subjects of Rome, who still reverenced the persons, or rather the names, of their sovereigns, beheld, with equal abhorrence, the rebels who opposed, and the ministers who abused, the authority of the throne.

Theodosius had tarnished the glory of his reign by the elevation (A.D. 386—395) of Rufinus; an odious favourite, who, in an age of civil and religious faction, has deserved, from every party, the imputation of every crime. The strong impulse of ambition and avarice[1] had urged Rufinus to abandon his native country, an obscure corner of Gaul,[2] to advance his fortune in the capital of the East: the talent of bold and ready elocution (*Philostorg*. l. xi. c. 3. *Godefroy's Dissert.* p. 440) qualified him to succeed in the lucrative profession of the law; and his success in that profession was a regular step to the most honourable and important employments of the state. He was raised, by just degrees, to the station of master of the offices. In the exercise of his various functions, so essentially connected with the whole system of civil government, he acquired the confidence of a monarch, who soon discovered his diligence and capacity in business, and who long remained ignorant of the pride, the malice, and the covetousness of his disposition. These vices were concealed beneath the mask of profound dissimulation;[3] his passions were subservient only to the passions of his master; yet, in the horrid massacre of Thessalonica, the cruel Rufinus inflamed the fury, without imitating the repentance, of Theodosius. The minister who viewed with proud indifference the rest of mankind, never forgave the appearance of an injury; and his personal enemies had forfeited, in his opinion the merit of all public services. Promotus, the master-general of the infantry, had saved the empire from the invasion of the Ostrogoths; but he indignantly supported the pre-eminence of a rival whose character and profession he despised; and, in the midst of a public council, the impatient

[1] Alecto, envious of the public felicity, convenes an infernal synod. Megæra recommends her pupil Rufinus, and excites him to deeds of mischief, &c. But there is as much difference between Claudian's fury and that of Virgil, as between the characters of Turnus and Rufinus.

[2] It is evident (Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 770.), though de Marca is ashamed of his countryman, that Rufinus was born at Elusa, the metropolis of Novempopulania, now a small village of Gascony (d'Anville, Not. de l'Anc. Gaule, p. 289.).

[3] A passage of Suidas is expressive of his profound dissimulation; βαθυγνωμων ανθρωπος και κρυψινος.

soldier was provoked to chastise with a blow the indecent pride of the favourite. This act of violence was represented to the emperor as an insult, which it was incumbent on *his* dignity to resent. The disgrace and exile of Promotus were signified by a peremptory order to repair, without delay, to a military station on the banks of the Danube; and the death of that general (though he was slain in a skirmish with the Barbarians) was imputed to the perfidious arts of Rufinus.—*Zos.* l. iv. 272. The sacrifice of an hero gratified his revenge; the honours of the consulship elated his vanity; but his power was still imperfect and precarious, as long as the important posts of præfect of the East, and of præfect of Constantinople, were filled by Tatian,[1] and his son Proculus; whose united authority balanced, for some time, the ambition and favour of the master of the offices. The two præfects were accused of rapine and corruption in the administration of the laws and finances. For the trial of these illustrious offenders, the emperor constituted a special commission; several judges were named to share the guilt and reproach of injustice; but the right of pronouncing sentence was reserved to the president alone, and that president was Rufinus himself. The father, stripped of the præfecture of the East, was thrown into a dungeon; but the son, conscious that few ministers can be found innocent, where an enemy is their judge, had secretly escaped; and Rufinus must have been satisfied with the least obnoxious victim, if despotism had not condescended to employ the basest and most ungenerous artifice. The prosecution was conducted with an appearance of equity and moderation, which flattered Tatian with the hope of a favourable event; his confidence was fortified by the solemn assurances, and perfidious oaths, of the president, who presumed to interpose the sacred name of Theodosius himself; and the unhappy father was at last persuaded to recall, by a private letter, the fugitive Proculus. He was instantly seized, examined, condemned, and beheaded, in one of the suburbs of Constantinople, with a precipitation which disappointed the clemency of the emperor. Without respecting the misfortunes of a consular senator, the cruel judges of Tatian compelled him to behold the execution of his son: the fatal cord was fastened round his own neck; but in the moment when he expected, and perhaps desired, the relief of a speedy death, he was permitted to consume the miserable remnant of his old age in poverty and exile.[2] The punishment of the two præfects might, perhaps, be excused by the exceptionable parts of their own conduct; the enmity of Rufinus might be palliated by the jealous and unsociable nature of ambition. But he indulged a spirit of revenge, equally repugnant to prudence and to justice, when he degraded their native country of Lycia, from the rank of Roman provinces; stigmatised a guiltless

[1] Zosimus, who describes the fall of Tatian and his son (l. iv. 273.), asserts their innocence: and even *his* testimony may outweigh the charges of their enemies (Cod. Theod. iv. p. 489.), who accuse them of oppressing the *Curiæ*. The connexion of Tatian with the Arians, while he was præfect of Egypt (A.D. 373.), inclines Tillemont to believe that he was guilty of every crime (Hist. des Emp. v. 360. Mem. Eccles. vi. 589.).

[2] —— Juvenum rorantia colla
Ante patrum vultus strictâ cecidere securi.
Ibat grandævus nato moriente superstes
Post trabeas exsul. In Rufin. i. 248.

The *facts* of Zosimus explain the *allusions* of Claudian; but his classic interpreters were ignorant of the fourth century. The *fatal cord*, I found, with the help of Tillemont, in a sermon of St. Asterius of Amasea.

people with a mark of ignominy; and declared that the countrymen of Tatian and Proculus should ever remain incapable of holding any employment of honour or advantage, under the Imperial government.[1] The new præfect of the East (for Rufinus instantly succeeded to the vacant honours of his adversary) was not diverted, however, by the most criminal pursuits, from the performance of the religious duties, which in that age were considered as the most essential to salvation. In the suburb of Chalcedon, surnamed the *Oak*, he had built a magnificent villa; to which he devoutly added a stately church, consecrated to the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and continually sanctified by the prayers, and penance, of a regular society of monks. A numerous, and almost general, synod of the bishops of the eastern empire, was summoned to celebrate, at the same time, the dedication of the church, and the baptism of the founder. This double ceremony was performed with extraordinary pomp; and when Rufinus was purified, in the holy font, from all the sins that he had hitherto committed, a venerable hermit of Egypt rashly proposed himself as the sponsor of a proud and ambitious statesman.[2]

The character of Theodosius imposed on his minister the task of hypocrisy, which disguised, and sometimes restrained, the abuse of power; and Rufinus was (A.D. 395) apprehensive of disturbing the indolent slumber of a prince, still capable of exerting the abilities, and the virtue, which had raised him to the throne.[3] But the absence, and, soon afterwards, the death, of the emperor, confirmed the absolute authority of Rufinus over the person and dominions of Arcadius; a feeble youth, whom the imperious præfect considered as his pupil rather than his sovereign. Regardless of the public opinion, he indulged his passions without remorse, and without resistance; and his malignant and rapacious spirit rejected every passion that might have contributed to his own glory, or the happiness of the people. His avarice,[4] which seems to have prevailed in his corrupt mind over every other sentiment, attracted the wealth of the East, by the various arts of partial, and general, extortion; oppressive taxes, scandalous bribery, immoderate fines, unjust confiscations, forced or fictitious testaments, by which the tyrant despoiled of their lawful inheritance the children of

[1] This odious law is recited, and repealed, by Arcadius (A.D. 396.), in the Theod. Code, l. ix. tit. xxxviii. leg. 9. The sense, as it is explained by Claudian (in Rufin. i. 234.) and Godefroy (iii. 279.), is perfectly clear.

—Exscindere cives Funditus; et nomen gentis delere laborat.

The scruples of Pagi and Tillemont can arise only from their zeal for the glory of Theodosius.

[2] Ammonius . . . . Rufinum propriis manibus suscepit sacro fonte mundatum. Rosweyde's Vitæ Patrum, p. 947. Soz. (l. viii. c. 17.) mentions the church and monastery; and Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. ix. 593.) records this synod, in which St. Gregory of Nyssa performed a conspicuous part.

[3] Montesquieu (Esprit des Loix, l. xii. c. 12.) praises one of the laws of Theodosius, addressed to the præfect Rufinus (l. ix. tit. iv. leg. unic.), to discourage the prosecution of treasonable, or sacrilegious, words. A tyrannical statute always proves the existence of tyranny; but a laudable edict may only contain the specious professions, or ineffectual wishes, of the prince or his ministers. This, I am afraid, is a just, though mortifying, canon of criticism.

[4] ———— fluctibus auri Congestæ cumulantur opes; orbisque rapinas
Expleri ille calor nequit——— Accipit una domus———
* * * * * * *

This character (Claudian, in Rufin. i. 184.) is confirmed by Jerom, a disinterested witness (dedecus insatiabilis avaritiæ, i. ad Heliodor. p. 26.), by Zos. (l. v. 286.), and by Suidas who copied the history of Eunapius.

strangers, or enemies; and the public sale of justice, as well as of favour, which he instituted in the palace of Constantinople. The ambitious candidate eagerly solicited, at the expence of the fairest part of his patrimony, the honours and emoluments of some provincial government: the lives and fortunes of the unhappy people were abandoned to the most liberal purchaser; and the public discontent was sometimes appeased by the sacrifice of an unpopular criminal, whose punishment was profitable only to the præfect of the East, his accomplice and his judge. If avarice were not the blindest of the human passions, the motives of Rufinus might excite our curiosity; and we might be tempted to inquire, with what view he violated every principle of humanity and justice, to accumulate those immense treasures, which he could not spend without folly, nor possess without danger. Perhaps he vainly imagined, that he laboured for the interest of an only daughter, on whom he intended to bestow his royal pupil, and the august rank of Empress of the East. Perhaps he deceived himself by the opinion, that his avarice was the instrument of his ambition. He aspired to place his fortune on a secure and independent basis, which should no longer depend on the caprice of the young emperor; yet he neglected to conciliate the hearts of the soldiers and people, by the liberal distribution of those riches, which he had acquired with so much toil, and with so much guilt. The extreme parsimony of Rufinus left him only the reproach, and envy, of ill-gotten wealth; his dependents served him without attachment; the universal hatred of mankind was repressed only by the influence of servile fear. The fate of Lucian proclaimed to the East, that the præfect, whose industry was much abated in the dispatch of ordinary business, was active and indefatigable in the pursuit of revenge. Lucian, the son of the præfect Florentius, the oppressor of Gaul, and the enemy of Julian, had employed a considerable part of his inheritance, the fruit of rapine and corruption, to purchase the friendship of Rufinus, and the high office of Count of the East. But the new magistrate imprudently departed from the maxims of the court, and of the times; disgraced his benefactor, by the contrast of a virtuous and temperate administration; and presumed to refuse an act of injustice, which might have tended to the profit of the emperor's uncle. Arcadius was easily persuaded to resent the supposed insult; and the præfect of the East resolved to execute in person the cruel vengeance, which he meditated against this ungrateful delegate of his power. He performed with incessant speed the journey of seven or eight hundred miles, from Constantinople to Antioch, entered the capital of Syria at the dead of night, and spread universal consternation among a people, ignorant of his design, but not ignorant of his character. The count of the fifteen provinces of the East was dragged, like the vilest malefactor, before the arbitrary tribunal of Rufinus. Notwithstanding the clearest evidence of his integrity, which was not impeached even by the voice of an accuser, Lucian was condemned, almost without a trial, to suffer a cruel and ignominious punishment. The ministers of the tyrant, by the order, and in the presence, of their master, beat him on the neck with leather thongs, armed at the extremities with lead; and when he fainted under the violence of the pain, he was removed in a close litter, to

conceal his dying agonies from the eyes of the indignant city. No sooner had Rufinus perpetrated this inhuman act, the sole object of his expedition, than he returned, amidst the deep and silent curses of a trembling people, from Antioch to Constantinople; and his diligence was accelerated by the hope of accomplishing, without delay, the nuptials of his daughter with the emperor of the East.[1]

But Rufinus soon experienced, that a prudent minister should constantly secure his royal captive by the strong, though invisible, chain of habit; and that the merit, and much more easily the favour, of the absent, are obliterated in a short time from the mind of a weak and capricious sovereign. While the præfect satiated his revenge at Antioch, a secret conspiracy of the favourite eunuchs, directed by the great chamberlain Eutropius, undermined his power in the palace of Constantinople. They discovered that Arcadius was not inclined to love the daughter of Rufinus, who had been chosen, without his consent, for his bride; and they contrived to substitute (A.D. 395. April 27) in her place the fair Eudoxia, the daughter of Bauto,[2] a general of the Franks in the service of Rome; and who was educated, since the death of her father, in the family of the sons of Promotus. The young emperor, whose chastity had been strictly guarded by the pious care of his tutor Arsenius,[3] eagerly listened to the artful and flattering description of the charms of Eudoxia: he gazed with impatient ardour on her picture, and he understood the necessity of concealing his amorous designs from the knowledge of a minister, who was so deeply interested to oppose the consummation of his happiness. Soon after the return of Rufinus, the approaching ceremony of the royal nuptials was announced to the people of Constantinople, who prepared to celebrate, with false and hollow acclamations, the fortune of his daughter. A splendid train of eunuchs and officers issued, in hymeneal pomp, from the gates of the palace; bearing aloft the diadem, the robes, and the inestimable ornaments, of the future empress. The solemn procession passed through the streets of the city, which were adorned with garlands, and filled with spectators; but, when it reached the house of the sons of Promotus, the principal eunuch respectfully entered the mansion, invested the fair Eudoxia with the Imperial robes, and conducted her in triumph to the palace and bed of Arcadius.[4] The secresy and success with which this conspiracy against Rufinus had been conducted, imprinted a mark of indelible ridicule on the character of a minister, who had suffered himself to be deceived, in a post where the arts of deceit and dissimulation constitute the

[1] ———— Cætera segnis; Impiger ire vias.
Ad facinus velox; penitus regione remotas

This allusion of Claudian (in Rufin. i. 241.) is again explained by the circumstantial narrative of Zosimus (l. v. 288.).

[2] Zos. (l. iv. 243.) praises the valour, prudence, and integrity of Bauto the Frank. Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 771.

[3] Arsenius escaped from the palace of Constantinople, and passed 55 years in rigid penance in the monasteries of Egypt. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xiv. 676; and Fleury, Hist. Eccles. v. p. 1, &c.; but the latter, for want of authentic materials, has given too much credit to the legend of Metaphrastes.

[4] This story (Zos. l. v. 290.) proves that the hymeneal rites of antiquity were still practised, without idolatry, by the Christians of the East; and the bride was *forcibly* conducted from the house of her parents to that of her husband. Our form of marriage requires, with less delicacy, the express and public consent of a virgin.

most distinguished merit. He considered, with a mixture of indignation and fear, the victory of an aspiring eunuch, who had secretly captivated the favour of his sovereign; and the disgrace of his daughter whose interest was inseparably connected with his own, wounded the tenderness, or, at least, the pride, of Rufinus. At the moment when he flattered himself that he should become the father of a line of kings. a foreign maid, who had been educated in the house of his implacable enemies, was introduced into the Imperial bed; and Eudoxia soon displayed a superiority of sense and spirit, to improve the ascendant which her beauty must acquire over the mind of a fond and youthful husband. The emperor would soon be instructed to hate, to fear, and to destroy, the powerful subject, whom he had injured; and the consciousness of guilt deprived Rufinus of every hope, either of safety or comfort, in the retirement of a private life. But he still possessed the most effectual means of defending his dignity, and perhaps of oppressing his enemies. The præfect still exercised an uncontrolled authority over the civil and military government of the East: and his treasures, if he could resolve to use them, might be employed to procure proper instruments, for the execution of the blackest designs, that pride, ambition, and revenge, could suggest to a desperate statesman. The character of Rufinus seemed to justify the accusations, that he conspired against the person of his sovereign, to seat himself on the vacant throne; and that he had secretly invited the Huns, and the Goths, to invade the provinces of the empire, and to increase the public confusion. The subtle præfect, whose life had been spent in the intrigues of the palace, opposed, with equal arms, the artful measures of the eunuch Eutropius; but the timid soul of Rufinus was astonished by the hostile approach of a more formidable rival, of the great Stilicho, the general, or rather the master, of the empire of the West.[1]

The celestial gift which Achilles obtained, and Alexander envied, of a poet worthy to celebrate the actions of heroes, has been enjoyed by Stilicho, in a much higher degree than might have been expected from the declining state of genius, and of art. The muse of Claudian,[2] devoted to his service, was always prepared to stigmatize his adversaries, Rufinus, or Eutropius, with eternal infamy; or to paint, in the most splendid colours, the victories, and virtues, of a powerful benefactor. In the review of a period indifferently supplied with authentic materials, we cannot refuse to illustrate the annals of Honorius, from the invectives, or the panegyrics, of a contemporary writer; but as Claudian appears to have indulged the most ample privilege of a poet and a courtier, some criticism will be requisite to translate the language of fiction, or exaggeration, into the truth and simplicity of historic prose. His silence concerning the family of Stilicho may be admitted as a proof, that his patron was neither able, nor desirous, to boast of a long series of illustrious progenitors; and the slight mention of his father, an officer of Barbarian cavalry, in the service of Valens, seems to countenance the assertion, that the general, who so long com-

[1] Zos. (l. v. 290.), Oros. (l. vii. c. 37.), and Chron. of Marcellinus. Claudian (Rufin. ii. 7—100.) paints, in lively colours, the distress and guilt of the præfect.

[2] Stilicho, directly or indirectly, is the perpetual theme of Claudian. The youth and private life of the hero, are vaguely expressed in the poem on his first consulship, 35—140.

manded the armies of Rome, was descended from the savage and perfidious race of the Vandals.[1] If Stilicho had not possessed the external advantages of strength and stature, the most flattering bard, in the presence of so many thousand spectators, would have hesitated to affirm, that he surpassed the measure of the demi-gods of antiquity; and, that whenever he moved, with lofty steps, through the streets of the capital, the astonished crowd made room for the stranger, who displayed, in a private condition, the awful majesty of a hero. From his earliest youth he embraced the profession of arms; his prudence and valour were soon distinguished in the field; the horsemen and archers of the East admired his superior dexterity; and in each degree of his military promotions, the public judgment always prevented and approved the choice of the sovereign. He was named by Theodosius, to ratify a solemn treaty with the monarch of Persia: he supported, during that important embassy, the dignity of the Roman name; and after his return to Constantinople, his merit was rewarded by an intimate and honourable alliance with the Imperial family. Theodosius had been prompted, by a pious motive of fraternal affection, to adopt, for his own, the daughter of his brother Honorius; the beauty and accomplishments of Serena[2] were universally admired by the obsequious court; and Stilicho obtained the preference over a crowd of rivals, who ambitiously disputed the hand of the princess, and the favour of her adoptive father.[3] The assurance that the husband of Serena would be faithful to the throne, which he was permitted to approach, engaged the emperor to exalt the fortunes, and to employ the abilities, of the sagacious and intrepid Stilicho. He rose (A.D. 385—408) through the successive steps of master of the horse, and count of the domestics, to the supreme rank of master-general of all the cavalry and infantry of the Roman, or at least of the Western, empire;[4] and his enemies confessed that he invariably disdained to barter for gold the rewards of merit, or to defraud the soldiers of the pay and gratifications, which they deserved or claimed, from the liberality of the state.[5] The valour and conduct which he afterwards displayed, in the defence of Italy, against the arms of Alaric and Radagaisus, may justify the fame of his early achievements; and in an age less attentive to the laws of honour, or of pride, the Roman generals might yield the pre-eminence of rank to the ascendant of superior genius.[6] He lamented, and revenged, the murder of Pro-

[1] Vandalorum, imbellis, avaræ, perfidæ, et dolosæ, gentis, genere editus. Oros. l. vii. c. 38. Jerom (i. ad Gerontiam, p. 93.) calls him a Semi-Barbarian.

[2] Claudian, in an imperfect poem, has drawn a fair, perhaps a flattering, portrait of Serena. That favourite niece of Theodosius was born, as well as her sister Thermantia, in Spain; from whence, in their earliest youth, they were honourably conducted to the palace of Constantinople.

[3] Some doubt may be entertained, whether this adoption was legal, or only metaphorical (Ducange, Fam. Byzant. p. 75.). An old inscription gives Stilicho the singular title of *Progener Divi Theodosii.*

[4] Claudian (Laus Serenæ, 190.) expresses in poetic language, the "dilectus equorum," and the "gemino mox idem culmine duxit agmina." The inscription adds, "count of the "domestics," an important command, which Stilicho, in the height of his grandeur, might prudently retain.

[5] The beautiful lines of Claudian (i. Cons. Stilich. ii. 113.) display *his* genius: but the integrity of Stilicho (in the military administration) is much more firmly established by the unwilling evidence of Zos. (l. v. 345.).

[6] ——— Si bellica moles
Ingrueret, Vamvis annis et jure minori,

motus, his rival and his friend; and the massacre of many thousands of the flying Bastarnæ is represented by the poet, as a bloody sacrifice, which the Roman Achilles offered to the manes of another Patroclus. The virtues and victories of Stilicho deserved the hatred of Rufinus: and the arts of calumny might have been successful, if the tender and vigilant Serena had not protected her husband against his domestic foes, whilst he vanquished in the field the enemies of the empire.[1] Theodosius continued to support an unworthy minister, to whose diligence he delegated the government of the palace, and of the East; but when he marched against the tyrant Eugenius, he associated his faithful general to the labours and glories of the civil war; and, in the last moments of his life, the dying monarch recommended to Stilicho, the care of his sons, and of the republic.[2] The ambition and the abilities of Stilicho were not unequal to the important trust; and he claimed the guardianship of the two empires, during the minority of Arcadius and Honorius.[3] The first measure of his administration, or rather of his reign, displayed to the nations the vigour and activity of a spirit worthy to command. He passed the Alps in the depth of winter; descended the stream of the Rhine, from the fortress of Basil, to the marches of Batavia; reviewed the state of the garrisons; repressed the enterprises of the Germans; and, after establishing along the banks a firm and honourable peace, returned with incredible speed to the palace of Milan.[4] The person and court of Honorius were subject to the master-general of the West; and the armies and provinces of Europe obeyed, without hesitation, a regular authority, which was exercised in the name of their young sovereign. Two rivals only remained to dispute the claims, and to provoke the vengeance, of Stilicho. Within the limits of Africa, Gildo, the Moor, maintained a proud and dangerous independence; and the minister of Constantinople asserted his equal reign over the emperor, and the empire, of the East.

The impartiality which Stilicho affected, as the common guardian of the royal brothers, engaged him to regulate (A.D. 395. Nov. 27) the equal division of the arms, the jewels, and the magnificent wardrobe and furniture of the deceased emperor.[5] But the most important object of the inheritance consisted of the numerous legions, cohorts,

Cedere grandævos equitum peditumque magitros
Adspiceres.——— Claudian, Laus Seren. p. 196.

A modern general would deem their submission either heroic patriotism, or abject servility.

[1] Compare the poem on the first consulariship (i. 95.) with the *Laus Serenæ* (227. where it unfortunately breaks off.). We may perceive the deep inveterate malice of Rufinus.

[2] ——Quem *fratribus* ipse Discedens, clypeumque defensoremque dedisti.

Yet the nomination (iv. Cons. Hon. 432.) was private (iii. Cons. Hon. 142.) cunctos discedere . . . jubet; and may therefore be suspected. Zosimus, and Suidas, apply to Stilicho, and Rufinus, the same equal title of Επιτροποι, guardians, or procurators.

[3] The Roman law distinguishes two sorts of *minority*, which expired at the age of fourteen, and of twenty-five. The one was subject to the *tutor*, or guardian, of the person; the other to the *curator*, or trustee, of the estate (Heineccius, Antiq. Rom. ad Jurisprud. pertinent. l. i. tit. xxii, xxiii. 218.). But these legal ideas were never accurately transferred into the constitution of an elective monarchy.

[4] Claudian (i. Cons. Stilich. i. 188., ;) but he must allow more than 15 days for the journey and return, between Milan and Leyden.

[5] I. Cons. Stilich. ii. 18. Not only the robes and diadems of the deceased emperor, but even the helmets, sword-hilts, belts, cuirasses, &c. were enriched with pearls, emeralds, and diamonds.

and squadrons of Romans, or Barbarians, whom the event of the civil war had united under the standard of Theodosius. The various multitudes of Europe and Asia, exasperated by recent animosities, were overawed by the authority of a single man; and the rigid discipline of Stilicho protected the lands of the citizen from the rapine of the licentious soldier.[1] Anxious, however, and impatient, to relieve Italy from the presence of this formidable host, which could be useful only on the frontiers of the empire, he listened to the just requisition of the minister of Arcadius, declared his intention of reconducting in person the troops of the East; and dexterously employed the rumour of a Gothic tumult, to conceal his private designs of ambition and revenge.[2] The guilty soul of Rufinus was alarmed by the approach of a warrior and a rival, whose enmity he deserved; he computed, with increasing terror, the narrow space of his life and greatness; and, as the last hope of safety, he interposed the authority of the emperor Arcadius. Stilicho, who appears to have directed his march along the sea-coast of the Hadriatic, was not far distant from the city of Thessalonica, when he received a peremptory message, to recall the troops of the East, and to declare, that *his* nearer approach would be considered, by the Byzantine court, as an act of hostility. The prompt and unexpected obedience of the general of the West, convinced the vulgar of his loyalty and moderation; and, as he had already engaged the affection of the Eastern troops, he recommended to their zeal the execution of his bloody design, which might be accomplished in his absence, with less danger perhaps, and with less reproach. Stilicho left the command of the troops of the East to Gainas, the Goth, on whose fidelity he firmly relied; with an assurance, at least, that the hardy Barbarian would never be diverted from his purpose by any consideration of fear or remorse. The soldiers were easily persuaded to punish the enemy of Stilicho, and of Rome; and such was the general hatred which Rufinus had excited, that the fatal secret, communicated to thousands, was faithfully preserved during the long march from Thessalonica to the gates of Constantinople. As soon as they had resolved his death, they condescended to flatter his pride; the ambitious præfect was seduced to believe, that those powerful auxiliaries might be tempted to place the diadem on his head; and the treasures which he distributed, with a tardy and reluctant hand, were accepted by the indignant multitude, as an insult, rather than as a gift. At the distance of a mile from the capital, in the field of Mars, before the palace of Hebdomon, the troops halted: and the emperor, as well as his minister, advanced, according to ancient custom, respectfully to salute the power which supported their throne. As Rufinus passed along the ranks, and disguised, with studied courtesy, his innate haughtiness, the wings insensibly wheeled from the right and left, and inclosed the devoted victim within the circle of their arms. Before he

[1] ———Tantoque remoto . . Principe, mutatas orbis non sensit habenas.
This high commendation (i. Cons. Stil. i. 149.) may be justified by the fears of the dying emperor (de Bell. Gildon. 292.); and the peace and good order which were enjoyed after his death (i. Cons. Stil. i. 150.).

[2] Stilicho's march, and the death of Rufinus, are described by Claudian (Rufin. l. ii. 101.), Zos. (l. v. 296.), Soz. (l. viii. c. 1.), Socr. (l. vi. c. 1.,) Philostorg. (l. xi. c. 3. with Godefroy, p. 441.), and Chron. of Marcellinus.

could reflect on the danger of his situation, Gainas gave the signal of death; a daring and forward soldier plunged his sword into the breast of the guilty præfect, and Rufinus fell, groaned, and expired, at the feet of the affrighted emperor. If the agonies of a moment could expiate the crimes of a whole life, or if the outrages inflicted on a breathless corpse could be the object of pity, our humanity might perhaps be affected by the horrid circumstances which accompanied the murder of Rufinus. His mangled body was abandoned to the brutal fury of the populace of either sex, who hastened in crowds, from every quarter of the city, to trample on the remains of the haughty minister, at whose frown they had so lately trembled. His right hand was cut off, and carried through the streets of Constantinople, in cruel mockery, to extort contributions for the avaricious tyrant, whose head was publicly exposed, borne aloft on the point of a long lance.[1] According to the savage maxims of the Greek republics, his innocent family would have shared the punishment of his crimes. The wife and daughter of Rufinus were indebted for their safety to the influence of religion. *Her* sanctuary protected them from the raging madness of the people; and they were permitted to spend the remainder of their lives in the exercises of Christian devotion, in the peaceful retirement of Jerusalem.[2]

The servile poet of Stilicho applauds, with ferocious joy, this horrid deed, which (A.D. 396, &c.), in the execution, perhaps, of justice, violated every law of nature and society, profaned the majesty of the prince, and renewed the dangerous examples of military licence. The contemplation of the universal order and harmony had satisfied Claudian of the existence of the Deity; but the prosperous impunity of vice appeared to contradict his moral attributes; and the fate of Rufinus was the only event which could dispel the religious doubts of the poet.[3] Such an act might vindicate the honour of Providence; but it did not much contribute to the happiness of the people. In less than three months they were informed of the maxims of the new administration, by a singular edict, which established the exclusive right of the treasury over the spoils of Rufinus; and silenced, under heavy penalties, the presumptuous claims of the subjects of the Eastern empire, who had been injured by his rapacious tyranny.[4] Even Stilicho did not derive from the murder of his rival, the fruit which he had proposed; and though he gratified his revenge, his ambition was disappointed. Under the name of a favourite, the weakness of Arcadius required a master; but he naturally preferred the obsequious arts of the eunuch Eutropius, who had obtained his domestic confidence; and the emperor contemplated, with terror and aversion, the stern

[1] The *dissection* of Rufinus, which Claudian performs with the savage coolness of an anatomist (Rufin. ii. 405.), is likewise specified by Zos. and Jerom (i. 26.).

[2] The Pagan Zosimus mentions their sanctuary and pilgrimage. The sister of Rufinus, Sylvania, who passed her life at Jerusalem, is famous in monastic history. 1. The studious virgin had diligently, and even repeatedly, perused the commentators on the Bible, Origen, Gregory, Basil, &c. to the amount of five millions of lines. 2. At the age of threescore, she could boast, that she had never washed her hands, face, or any part of her whole body, except the tips of her fingers, to receive the communion. Vitæ Patrum, p. 779.

[3] See the beautiful exordium of his invective against Rufinus, which is curiously discussed by the sceptic Bayle, Dict. Crit. RUFIN. Not. E.

[4] Theod. Code, l. ix. tit. xlii. leg. 14, 15. The new ministers attempted, with inconsistent avarice, to seize the spoils of their predecessor, and to provide for their own future security.

genius of a foreign warrior. Till they were divided by the jealousy of power, the sword of Gainas, and the charms of Eudoxia, supported the favour of the great chamberlain of the palace: the perfidious Goth, who was appointed master-general of the East, betrayed, without scruple, the interest of his benefactor; and the same troops, who had so lately massacred the enemy of Stilicho, were engaged to support, against him, the independence of the throne of Constantinople. The favourites of Arcadius fomented a secret and irreconcileable war against a formidable hero, who aspired to govern, and to defend, the two empires of Rome, and the two sons of Theodosius. They incessantly laboured, by dark and treacherous machinations, to deprive him of the esteem of the prince, the respect of the people, and the friendship of the Barbarians. The life of Stilicho was repeatedly attempted by the dagger of hired assassins; and a decree was obtained from the senate of Constantinople, to declare him an enemy of the republic, and to confiscate his ample possessions in the provinces of the East. At a time when the only hope of delaying the ruin of the Roman name, depended on the firm union, and reciprocal aid, of all the nations to whom it had been gradually communicated, the subjects of Arcadius and Honorius were instructed, by their respective masters, to view each other in a foreign, and even hostile, light; to rejoice in their mutual calamities, and to embrace, as their faithful allies, the Barbarians, whom they excited to invade the territories of their countrymen.[1] The natives of Italy affected to despise the servile and effeminate Greeks of Byzantium, who presumed to imitate the dress, and to usurp the dignity, of Roman senators;[2] and the Greeks had not yet forgot the sentiments of hatred and contempt, which their polished ancestors had so long entertained for the rude inhabitants of the West. The distinction of two governments, which soon produced the separation of two nations, will justify my design of suspending the series of the Byzantine history, to prosecute, without interruption, the disgraceful, but memorable, reign of Honorius.

The prudent Stilicho, instead of persisting to force the inclinations of a prince, and people, who rejected his government, wisely abandoned (A.D. 386—398) Arcadius to his unworthy favourites; and his reluctance to involve the two empires in a civil war, displayed the moderation of a minister, who had so often signalized his military spirit and abilities. But if Stilicho had any longer endured the revolt of Africa, he would have betrayed the security of the capital, and the majesty of the Western emperor, to the capricious insolence of a Moorish rebel. Gildo,[3] the brother of the tyrant Firmus, had preserved and obtained, as the reward of his apparent fidelity, the im-

[1] Claudian (i. Cons. Stilich. (l. i. 275. l. ii. 85.), and Zos. l. v. 302.

[2] Claudian turns the consulship of the eunuch Eutropius into a national reflection (l. ii. 134.).

——Plaudentem cerne senatum O patribus plebes, O digni consule patres.
Et Byzantinos proceres, *Graiosque* Quirites:

It is curious to observe the first symptoms of jealousy and schism, between old and new Rome, between the Greeks and Latins.

[3] Claudian may have exaggerated the vices of Gildo; but his Moorish extraction, his notorious actions, and the complaints of St. Augustin, may justify the poet's invectives. Baronius (Annal. Eccles. A.D. 398. No. 35—56.), has treated the African rebellion with skill and learning.

mense patrimony which was forfeited by treason; long and meritorious service, in the armies of Rome, raised him to the dignity of a military count; the narrow policy of the court of Theodosius had adopted the mischievous expedient, of supporting a legal government by the interest of a powerful family; and the brother of Firmus was invested with the command of Africa. His ambition soon usurped the administration of justice, and o. the finances, without account, and without control; and he maintained, during a reign of twelve years, the possession of an office from which it was impossible to remove him, without the danger of a civil war. During those twelve years, the provinces of Africa groaned under the dominion of a tyrant, who seemed to unite the unfeeling temper of a stranger, with the partial resentments of domestic faction. The forms of law were often superseded by the use of poison; and if the trembling guests, who were invited to the table of Gildo, presumed to express their fears, the insolent suspicion served only to excite his fury, and he loudly summoned the ministers of death. Gildo alternately indulged the passions of avarice and lust.[1] In the civil war between Theodosius and Eugenius, the count, or rather the sovereign, of Africa, maintained a haughty and suspicious neutrality; refused to assist either of the contending parties with troops or vessels, expected the declaration of fortune, and reserved for the conqueror, the vain professions of his allegiance. Such professions would not have satisfied the master of the Roman world: but the death of Theodosius, and the weakness and discord of his sons, confirmed the power of the Moor; who condescended, as a proof of his moderation, to abstain from the use of the diadem, and to supply Rome with the customary tribute, or rather subsidy, of corn. In every division of the empire, the five provinces of Africa were invariably assigned to the West; and Gildo had consented to govern that extensive country in the name of Honorius; but his knowledge of the character and designs of Stilicho, soon engaged him to address his homage to a more distant and feeble sovereign. The ministers of Arcadius embraced the cause of a perfidious rebel; and the delusive hope of adding the numerous cities of Africa to the empire of the East, tempted them to assert a claim, which they were incapable of supporting, either by reason, or by arms.[2]

When Stilicho had given a firm and decisive answer to the pretensions of the Byzantine court, he (A.D. 397) solemnly accused the tyrant of Africa before the tribunal, which had formerly judged the kings and nations of the earth; and the image of the republic was revived, after a long interval, under the reign of Honorius. The emperor transmitted an accurate and ample detail of the complaints of the provincials, and the crimes of Gildo, to the Roman senate; and the members of that venerable assembly were required to pronounce the condemnation of the rebel. Their unanimous suffrage declared him the enemy of the republic; and the decree of the senate added a sacred and legitimate

[1] Baronius condemns, severely, the licentiousness of Gildo; as his wife, his daughter, and his sister, were examples of perfect chastity. The adulteries of the African soldiers are checked by one of the Imperial laws.

[2] Inque tuam sortem numerosas transtulit u[illegible]

Claudian (de Bell. Gildonico, 230.) has touched, with political delicacy, the intrigues of the Byzantine court, which are likewise mentioned by Zos. (l. v. 302.).

sanction, to the Roman arms.[1] A people, who still remembered, that their ancestors had been the masters of the world, would have applauded, with conscious pride, the representation of ancient freedom; if they had not long since been accustomed to prefer the solid assurance of bread, to the unsubstantial visions of liberty and greatness. The subsistence of Rome depended on the harvests of Africa; and it was evident, that a declaration of war would be the signal of famine. The præfect Symmachus, who presided in the deliberations of the senate, admonished the minister of his just apprehension, that as soon as the revengeful Moor should prohibit the exportation of corn, the tranquillity, and perhaps the safety, of the capital, would be threatened by the hungry rage of a turbulent multitude.[2] The prudence of Stilicho conceived, and executed, without delay, the most effectual measure for the relief of the Roman people. A large and seasonable supply of corn, collected in the inland provinces of Gaul, was embarked on the rapid stream of the Rhone, and transported, by an easy navigation, from the Rhone to the Tyber. During the whole term of the African war, the granaries of Rome were continually filled, her dignity was vindicated from the humiliating dependence, and the minds of an immense people were quieted by the calm confidence of peace and plenty.[3]

The cause of Rome, and the conduct of the African war (A.D. 398), were entrusted by Stilicho, to a general, active and ardent to avenge his private injuries on the head of the tyrant. The spirit of discord, which prevailed in the house of Nabal, had excited a deadly quarrel between two of his sons, Gildo and Mascezel.[4] The usurper pursued, with implacable rage, the life of his younger brother, whose courage and abilities he feared; and Mascezel, oppressed by superior power, took refuge in the court of Milan: where he soon received the cruel intelligence, that his two innocent and helpless children had been murdered by their inhuman uncle. The affliction of the father was suspended only by the desire of revenge. The vigilant Stilicho already prepared to collect the naval and military forces of the Western empire; and he had resolved, if the tyrant should be able to wage an equal and doubtful war, to march against him in person. But as Italy required his presence, and as it might be dangerous to weaken the defence of the frontier, he judged it more advisable, that Mascezel should attempt this arduous adventure, at the head of a chosen body of Gallic veterans, who had lately served under the standard of Eugenius. These troops, who were exhorted to convince the world, that they could subvert, as well as defend, the throne of an usurper, consisted of the *Jovian*, the *Herculian*, and the *Augustan*, legions; of the *Nervian* auxiliaries; of the soldiers who displayed in their banners the symbol of a *lion*, and of the troops which were distinguished by the auspicious names of *Fortunate*, and *Invincible*.

[1] Symmach. (l. iv. epist. 4.) expresses the judicial forms of the senate; and Claudian (i. Cons. Stilich. l. i. 325.) seems to feel the spirit of a Roman.

[2] Claudian finely displays these complaints of Symmachus, in a speech of the goddess of Rome, before the throne of Jupiter (de Bell. Gildon. 28.).

[3] Claudian (in Eutrop. l. i. 401. i. Cons. Stil. l. i. 306. ii. Cons. Stilich. 91.).

[4] He was of a mature age; since he had formerly (A.D. 373.) served against his brother Firmus (Ammian. xxix. 5.). Claudian, who understood the court of Milan, dwells on the injuries, rather than the merits, of Mascezel (de Bell. Gild. 389.). The Moorish war was not worthy of Honorius, or Stilicho, &c.

Yet such was the smallness of their establishments, or the difficulty of recruiting, that these *seven* bands,[1] of high dignity and reputation in the service of Rome, amounted to no more than 5000 effective men.[2] The fleet of gallies and transports sailed in tempestuous weather from the port of Pisa, in Tuscany, and steered their course to the little island of Caprera; which had borrowed that name from the wild goats, its original inhabitants, whose place was now occupied by a new colony of a strange and savage appearance. "The whole "island (says an ingenious traveller of those times) is filled, or rather "defiled, by men, who fly from the light. They call themselves "*monks*, or solitaries, because they chuse to live alone, without any "witnesses of their actions. They fear the gifts of fortune, from the "apprehension of losing them; and, lest they should be miserable, "they embrace a life of voluntary wretchedness. How absurd is "their choice! how perverse their understanding! to dread the "evils, without being able to support the blessings, of the human con-"dition. Either this melancholy madness is the effect of disease, or "else the consciousness of guilt urges these unhappy men to exercise "on their own bodies the tortures which are inflicted on fugitive "slaves by the hand of justice."[3] Such was the contempt of a profane magistrate for the monks of Caprera, who were revered, by the pious Mascezel, as the chosen servants of God.[4] Some of them were persuaded, by his intreaties, to embark on board the fleet; and it is observed, to the praise of the Roman general, that his days and nights were employed in prayer, fasting, and the occupation of singing psalms. The devout leader, who, with such a reinforcement, appeared confident of victory, avoided the dangerous rocks of Corsica, coasted along the eastern side of Sardinia, and secured his ships against the violence of the south wind, by casting anchor in the safe and capacious harbour of Cagliari, at the distance of 140 miles from the African shores.[5]

Gildo was prepared to resist the invasion (A.D. 398) with all the forces of Africa. By the liberality of his gifts and promises, he endeavoured to secure the doubtful allegiance of the Roman soldiers, whilst he attracted to his standard the distant tribes of Gætulia and Æthiopia. He proudly reviewed an army of 70,000 men, and boasted, with the rash presumption which is the forerunner of disgrace, that his numerous cavalry would trample under their horses' feet, the troops of Mascezel, and involve, in a cloud of burning sand, the

[1] Claudian, Bell. Gild. 415. The change of discipline allowed him to use indifferently the names of *Legio, Cohors, Manipulus. Notitia Imperii*, S. 38.

[2] Oros. (l. vii. c. 36. p. 565.) qualifies this account with an expression of doubt (ut aiunt), and it scarcely coincides with the δυναμεις αδρας of Zosimus (l. v. 303.). Yet Claudian, after some declamation about Cadmus's soldiers, frankly owns, that Stilicho sent a small army; lest the rebel should fly, ne timeare times (i. Cons. Stilich. l. i. 314.).

[3] Claud. Rutil. Numatian. Itinerar. i. 439. He afterwards (515.) mentions a religious madman on the isle of Gorgona. For such profane remarks, Rutilius, and his accomplices, are styled by his commentator, Barthius, rabiosi canes diaboli. Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. xii. 471.) more calmly observes, that the unbelieving poet praises where he means to censure.

[4] Oros. l. vii. c. 36. p. 564. Augustin commends two of these savage saints of the isle of Goats (epist. lxxxi. apud Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xiii. 317. and Baronius, Annal. Eccles. A.D. 398. No. 51.).

[5] Here the first book of the Gildonic war is terminated. The rest of Claudian's poem has been lost, and we are ignorant *how*, or *where*, the army made good their landing in Africa.

natives of the cold regions of Gaul and Germany.[1] But the Moor, who commanded the legions of Honorius, was too well acquainted with the manners of his countrymen, to entertain any serious apprehension of a naked and disorderly host of Barbarians; whose left arm, instead of a shield, was protected only by a mantle; who were totally disarmed as soon as they had darted their javelin from their right hand; and whose horses had never been taught to bear the control, or to obey the guidance, of the bridle. He fixed his camp of 5000 veterans in the face of a superior enemy, and, after the delay of three days, gave the signal of a general engagement.[2] As Mascezel advanced before the front with fair offers of peace and pardon, he encountered one of the foremost standard-bearers of the Africans, and, on his refusal to yield, struck him on the arm with his sword. The arm, and the standard, sunk under the weight of the blow; and the imaginary act of submission was hastily repeated by all the standards of the line. At this signal, the disaffected cohorts proclaimed the name of their lawful sovereign; the Barbarians, astonished by the defection of their Roman allies, dispersed, according to their custom, in tumultuary flight; and Mascezel obtained the honours of an easy, and almost bloodless, victory.[3] The tyrant escaped from the field of battle to the sea-shore; and threw himself into a small vessel, with the hope of reaching in safety some friendly port of the empire of the East: but the obstinacy of the wind drove him back into the harbour of Tabraca,[4] which had acknowledged, with the rest of the province, the dominion of Honorius, and the authority of his lieutenant. The inhabitants, as a proof of their repentance and loyalty, seized and confined the person of Gildo in a dungeon; and his own despair saved him from the intolerable torture of supporting the presence of an injured, and victorious, brother.[5] The captives, and the spoils, of Africa, were laid at the feet of the emperor; but Stilicho, whose moderation appeared more conspicuous, and more sincere, in the midst of prosperity, still affected to consult the laws of the republic; and referred to the senate and people of Rome, the judgment of the most illustrious criminals.[6] Their trial was public and solemn; but the judges, in the exercise of this obsolete and precarious jurisdiction, were impatient to punish the African magistrates, who had intercepted the subsistence of the Roman people. The rich and guilty province was oppressed by the Imperial

[1] Orosius must be responsible for the account. The presumption of Gildo and his various train of Barbarians is celebrated by Claudian (i. Cons. Stil. l. i. 345.).

[2] St. Ambrose, who had been dead about a year, revealed, in a vision, the time and place of the victory. Mascezel afterwards related his dream to Paulinus, the original biographer of the saint, from whom it might easily pass to Orosius.

[3] Zos. (l. v. 303.) supposes an obstinate combat; but the narrative of Orosius appears to conceal a real fact, under the disguise of a miracle.

[4] Tabraca lay between the two Hippos (Cellarius, ii. p. ii. 112.; d'Anville, iii. 84.). Orosius has distinctly named the field of battle, but our ignorance cannot define the precise situation.

[5] The death of Gildo is expressed by Claudian (i. Cons. Stil. l. 357.), and his best interpreters, Zosimus and Orosius.

[6] Claudian (ii. Cons. Stilich. 99.) describes their trial (tremuit quos Africa nuper, cernunt rostra reos), and applauds the restoration of the ancient constitution. It is here that he introduces the famous sentence, so familiar to the friends of despotism:

——Nunquam libertas gratior exstat Quam sub rege pio.——

But the freedom, which depends on royal piety, scarcely deserves that appellation.

ministers, who had a visible interest to multiply the number of the accomplices of Gildo; and if an edict of Honorius seems to check the malicious industry of informers, a subsequent edict, at the distance of ten years, continues and renews the prosecution of the offences which had been committed in the time of the general rebellion.[1] The adherents of the tyrant who escaped the first fury of the soldiers, and the judges, might derive some consolation from the tragic fate of his brother, who could never obtain his pardon for the extraordinary services which he had performed. After he had finished an important war in the space of a single winter, Mascezel was received at the court of Milan with loud applause, affected gratitude, and secret jealousy;[2] and his death, which, perhaps, was the effect of accident, has been considered as the crime of Stilicho. In the passage of a bridge, the Moorish prince, who accompanied the master-general of the West, was suddenly thrown from his horse into the river; the officious haste of the attendants was restrained by a cruel and perfidious smile, which they observed on the countenance of Stilicho; and while they delayed the necessary assistance, the unfortunate Mascezel was irrecoverably drowned.[3]

The joy of the African triumph was happily connected with the nuptials (A.D. 398) of the emperor Honorius, and of his cousin Maria, the daughter of Stilicho: and this equal and honourable alliance seemed to invest the powerful minister with the authority of a parent over his submissive pupil. The muse of Claudian was not silent on this propitious day:[4] he sung, in various and lively strains, the happiness of the royal pair; and the glory of the hero, who confirmed their union, and supported their throne. The ancient fables of Greece, which had almost ceased to be the object of religious faith, were saved from oblivion by the genius of poetry. The picture of the Cyprian grove, the seat of harmony and love; the triumphant progress of Venus over her native seas, and the mild influence which her presence diffused in the palace of Milan, express to every age the natural sentiments of the heart, in the just and pleasing language of allegorical fiction. But the amorous impatience, which Claudian attributes to the young prince, must excite the smiles of the court; and his beauteous spouse (if she deserved the praise of beauty) had not much to fear or to hope from the passions of her lover; Honorius was only in the fourteenth year of his age. His subjects, who attentively studied the character of their young sovereign, discovered that Honorius was without passions, and consequently without talents; and that his feeble and languid disposition was alike incapable of discharging the duties of his rank, or of enjoying the pleasures of his age. In his early youth he made some progress in the exercises of

[1] Theod. Code, l. ix. tit. xxxix. leg. 3. tit. xl. leg. 19.

[2] Stilicho, who claimed an equal share in all the victories of Theodosius and his son, particularly asserts, that Africa was recovered by the wisdom of *his* counsels (see an inscription produced by Baronius).

[3] I have softened the narrative of Zosimus, which, in its crude simplicity, is almost incredible (l. v. 303.). Orosius damns the victorious general (p. 538.), for violating the right of sanctuary.

[4] Claudian, as the poet laureate, composed a serious and elaborate epithalamium of 340 lines; besides some gay Fescennines which were sung, in a more licentious tone, on the wedding-night.

riding and drawing the bow: but he soon relinquished these fatiguing occupations, and the amusement of feeding poultry became the serious and daily care of the monarch of the West,[1] who resigned the reins of empire to the firm and skilful hand of his guardian Stilicho. The experience of history will countenance the suspicion, that a prince who was born in the purple, received a worse education than the meanest peasant of his dominions; and that the ambitious minister suffered him to attain the age of manhood, without attempting to excite his courage, or to enlighten his understanding.[2] The predecessors of Honorius were accustomed to animate, by their example, or at least by their presence, the valour of the legions; and the dates of their laws attest the perpetual activity of their motions through the provinces of the Roman world. But the son of Theodosius passed the slumber of his life, a captive in his palace, a stranger in his country, and the patient, almost the indifferent, spectator of the ruin of the Western empire, which was repeatedly attacked, and finally subverted, by the arms of the Barbarians. In the eventful history of a reign of twenty-eight years, it will seldom be necessary to mention the name of the emperor Honorius.

CHAPTER XXX.

Revolt of the Goths.—They plunder Greece.—Two great Invasions of Italy by Alaric and Radagaisus.—They are repulsed by Stilicho.—The Germans over-run Gaul.—Usurpation of Constantine in the West.—Disgrace and Death of Stilicho.

If the subjects of Rome could be ignorant of their obligations to the great Theodosius, they were too soon convinced, how painfully the spirit and abilities of their deceased emperor had supported the frail and mouldering edifice of the republic. He died in the month of January; and before the end of the winter of the same year (A.D. 395), the Gothic nation was in arms.[3] The Barbarian auxiliaries erected their independent standard; and boldly avowed the hostile designs which they had long cherished in their ferocious minds. Their countrymen, who had been condemned, by the conditions of the last treaty, to a life of tranquillity and labour, deserted their farms at the first sound of the trumpet; and eagerly resumed the weapons which they had reluctantly laid down. The barriers of the Danube were thrown open; the savage warriors of Scythia issued from their forests; and

[1] Procopius de Bell. Gothico, l. i. c. 2. I have borrowed the general practice of Honorius, without adopting the singular, and, indeed, improbable tale, which is related by the Greek historian.

[2] The lessons of Theodosius, or rather Claudian (iv. Cons. Honor. 214.) might compose a fine institution for the future prince of a great and free nation. It was far above Honorius, and his degenerate subjects.

[3] The revolt of the Goths, and the blockade of Constantinople, are distinctly mentioned by Claudian (in Rufin. l. ii. 7—100.), Zosimus (l. v. p. 292.), and Jornandes (de Rebus Geticis, c. 29.).

the uncommon severity of the winter allowed the poet to remark, "that "they rolled their ponderous waggons over the broad and icy back of "the indignant river."[1] The unhappy natives of the provinces to the South of the Danube, submitted to the calamities, which, in the course of twenty years, were almost grown familiar to their imagination; and the various troops of Barbarians, who gloried in the Gothic name, were irregularly spread from the woody shores of Dalmatia to the walls of Constantinople.[2] The interruption, or at least the diminution, of the subsidy, which the Goths had received from the prudent liberality of Theodosius, was the specious pretence of their revolt: the affront was embittered by their contempt for the unwarlike sons of Theodosius; and their resentment was inflamed by the weakness, or treachery, of the minister of Arcadius. The frequent visits of Rufinus to the camp of the Barbarians, whose arms and apparel he affected to imitate, were considered as a sufficient evidence of his guilty correspondence: and the public enemy, from a motive either of gratitude or of policy, was attentive, amidst the general devastation, to spare the private estates of the unpopular præfect. The Goths, instead of being impelled by the blind and headstrong passions of their chiefs, were now directed by the bold and artful genius of Alaric. That renowned leader was descended from the noble race of the Balti;[3] which yielded only to the royal dignity of the Amali: he had solicited the command of the Roman armies; and the Imperial court provoked him to demonstrate the folly of their refusal, and the importance of their loss. Whatever hopes might be entertained of the conquest of Constantinople, the judicious general soon abandoned an impracticable enterprise. In the midst of a divided court, and a discontented people, the emperor Arcadius was terrified by the aspect of the Gothic arms; but the want of wisdom and valour was supplied by the strength of the city; and the fortifications, both of the sea and land, might securely brave the impotent and random darts of the Barbarians. Alaric disdained to trample any longer on the prostrate and ruined countries of Thrace and Dacia, and he resolved to seek a plentiful harvest of fame and riches in a province which had hitherto escaped the ravages of war.[4]

The character of the civil and military officers, on whom Rufinus had devolved the government of Greece, confirmed the public suspicion, that he had betrayed the ancient seat of freedom and learning to the Gothic invader. The proconsul Antiochus was the unworthy son of a respectable father; and Gerontius, who commanded the pro-

[1] ———Alii per terga ferocis
Danubii solidata ruunt; expertaque remis
Frangunt stagna rotis.

Claudian and Ovid often amuse their fancy by interchanging the metaphors and properties of *liquid* water, and *solid* ice. Much false wit has been expended in this easy exercise.

[2] Jerom, i. p. 26. He endeavours to comfort his friend Heliodorus, bishop of Altinum, for the loss of his nephew Nepotian, by a curious recapitulation of all the public and private misfortunes of the times. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xii. p. 200.

[3] *Baltha*, or *bold:* origo mirifica, says Jornandes (c. 29.). This illustrious race long continued to flourish in France, in the Gothic province of Septimania, or Languedoc; under the corrupted appellation of *Baux:* and a branch of that family afterwards settled in the kingdom of Naples (Grotius in Prolegom. ad Hist. Gothic. p. 53.). The lords of Baux, near Arles, and of seventy-nine subordinate places, were independent of the counts of Provence (Longuerue Descrip. de la France, i. p. 357.).

[4] Zosimus (l. v. p. 293.) is our best guide for the conquest of Greece: but the hints and allusion of Claudian are so many rays of historic light.

vincial troops, was much better qualified to execute the oppressive orders of a tyrant, than to defend, with courage and ability, a country most remarkably fortified by the hand of nature. Alaric had traversed (A.D. 396), without resistance, the plains of Macedonia and Thessaly, as far as the foot of Mount Oeta, a steep and woody range of hills, almost impervious to his cavalry. They stretched from east to west, to the edge of the sea-shore; and left between the precipice and the Malian Gulf an interval of three hundred feet, which, in some places, was contracted to a road capable of admitting only a single carriage.[1] In this narrow pass of Thermopylæ, where Leonidas and the three hundred Spartans had gloriously devoted their lives, the Goths might have been stopped, or destroyed, by a skilful general; and perhaps the view of that sacred spot might have kindled some sparks of military ardour in the breasts of the degenerate Greeks. The troops which had been posted to defend the straits of Thermopylæ, retired, as they were directed, without attempting to disturb the secure and rapid passage of Alaric;[2] and the fertile fields of Phocis, and Bœotia, were instantly covered by a deluge of Barbarians; who massacred the males of an age to bear arms, and drove away the beautiful females, with the spoil, and cattle, of the flaming villages. The travellers, who visited Greece several years afterwards, could easily discover the deep and bloody traces of the march of the Goths; and Thebes was less indebted for her preservation to the strength of her seven gates, than to the eager haste of Alaric, who advanced to occupy the city of Athens, and the important harbour of the Piræus. The same impatience urged him to prevent the delay and danger of a siege, by the offer of a capitulation; and as soon as the Athenians heard the voice of the Gothic herald, they were easily persuaded to deliver the greatest part of their wealth, as the ransom of the city of Minerva, and its inhabitants. The treaty was ratified by solemn oaths, and observed with mutual fidelity. The Gothic prince, with a small and select train, was admitted within the walls; he indulged himself in the refreshment of the bath, accepted a splendid banquet which was provided by the magistrate, and affected to show that he was not ignorant of the manners of civilized nations.[3] But the whole territory of Attica, from the promontory of Sunium to the town of Megara, was blasted by his baleful presence; and, if we may use the comparison of a contemporary philosopher, Athens itself resembled the bleeding and empty skin of a slaughtered victim. The distance between Megara and Corinth could not much exceed thirty miles; but the *bad road*, an expressive name, which it still bears among the Greeks, was, or might easily have been made, impassable for the march of an

[1] Compare Herodotus (l. vii. c. 176.) and Livy (xxxvi. 15.). The narrow entrance of Greece was probably enlarged by each successive ravisher.

[2] He passed, says Eunap. (in Vit. Philosoph. p. 93. ed. Commelin, 1596.) through the straits, *δια των πυλων* (of Thermopylæ) *παρηλθεν ωσπερ δια σταδιου, και ἱπποκροτου πεδιου τρεχων.*

[3] In obedience to Jerom, and Claud. (Rufin. l. ii. 191.), I have mixed some darker colours in the mild representation of Zosimus, who wished to soften the calamities of Athens.

Nec fera Cecropias traxissent vincula matres.

Synesius (Epist. clvi. 272. ed. Petav.) observes, that Athens, whose sufferings he imputes to the proconsul's avarice, was at that time less famous for her schools of philosophy than for her trade of honey.

enemy. The thick and gloomy woods of Mount Cithæron covered the inland country; the Scironian rocks approached the water's edge, and hung over the narrow and winding path, which was confined above six miles along the sea-shore.[1] The passage of those rocks, so infamous in every age, was terminated by the isthmus of Corinth; and a small body of firm and intrepid soldiers might have successfully defended a temporary intrenchment of five or six miles from the Ionian to the Ægean sea. The confidence of the cities of Peloponnesus, in their natural rampart, had tempted them to neglect the care of their antique walls; and the avarice of the Roman governors had exhausted and betrayed the unhappy province.[2] Corinth, Argos, Sparta, yielded without resistance to the arms of the Goths; and the most fortunate of the inhabitants were saved, by death, from beholding the slavery of their families, and the conflagration of their cities.[3] The vases and statues were distributed among the Barbarians, with more regard to the value of the materials, than to the elegance of the workmanship; the female captives submitted to the laws of war; the enjoyment of beauty was the reward of valour; and the Greeks could not reasonably complain of an abuse, which was justified by the example of the heroic times.[4] The descendants of that extraordinary people, who had considered valour and discipline as the walls of Sparta, no longer remembered the generous reply of their ancestors to an invader more formidable than Alaric. "If thou art a god, thou wilt not hurt those "who have never injured thee; if thou art a man, advance:—and "thou wilt find men equal to thyself."[5] From Thermopylæ to Sparta, the leader of the Goths pursued his victorious march without encountering any mortal antagonists: but one of the advocates of expiring Paganism has confidently asserted, that the walls of Athens were guarded by the goddess Minerva, with her formidable Ægis, and by the angry phantom of Achilles;[6] and that the conqueror was dismayed by the presence of the hostile deities of Greece. In an age of miracles, it would perhaps be unjust to dispute the claim of the historian Zosimus to the common benefit; yet it cannot be dissembled, that the mind of Alaric was ill prepared to receive, either in sleeping or waking visions, the impressions of Greek superstition. The songs of Homer, and the fame of Achilles, had probably never reached the

1 ——— Vallata mari Scironia rupes, Isthmos ———
Et duo continuo connectens æquora muro Claudian de Bell. Getico, 188.

The Scironian rocks are described by Pausanias (l. i. c. 44. p. 107. ed. Kuhn) and our modern travellers, Wheeler (p. 436.) and Chandler (p. 298.). Hadrian made the road passable for two carriages.

2 Claud. (Rufin. l. ii. 186. and de Bello Getico, 611.) vaguely, though forcibly, delineates the scene of rapine and destruction.

3 Τρις μακαρες Δαναοι και τετρακις, &c. These generous lines of Homer (Odyss. l. v. 306.) were transcribed by one of the captive youths of Corinth: and the tears of Mummius may prove that the rude conqueror, though he was ignorant of the value of an original picture, possessed the purest source of good taste, a benevolent heart (Plutarch, Symposiac. l. ix. tom. ii. 737. ed. Wechel.).

4 Homer perpetually describes the exemplary patience of these female captives, who gave their charms, and even their hearts, to the murderers of their fathers, brothers, &c. Such a passion (of Eriphile for Achilles) is touched with admirable delicacy by Racine.

5 Plutarch (in Pyrrho, ii. 471. ed. Brian) gives the genuine answer in the Laconic dialect. Pyrrhus attacked Sparta with 25,000 foot, 2000 horse, and 24 elephants: and the defence of that open town is a fine comment on the laws of Lycurgus, even in the last stage of decay.

6 Such, perhaps, as Homer (Iliad, xx. 164.) has so nobly painted him.

ear of the illiterate *Barbarian;* and the *Christian* faith, which he had devoutly embraced, taught him to despise the imaginary deities of Rome and Athens. The invasion of the Goths, instead of vindicating the honour, contributed, at least accidentally, to extirpate the last remains of Paganism; and the mysteries of Ceres, which had subsisted eighteen hundred years, did not survive the destruction of Eleusis, and the calamities of Greece.[1]

The last hope of a people who could no longer depend on their arms, their gods, or their sovereign, was placed in the powerful assistance of the general of the West; and Stilicho, who had not been permitted to repulse, advanced to chastise, the invaders of Greece[2] (A.D. 397). A numerous fleet was equipped in the ports of Italy; and the troops, after a short and prosperous navigation over the Ionian sea, were safely disembarked on the isthmus, near the ruins of Corinth. The woody and mountainous country of Arcadia, the fabulous residence of Pan and the Dryads, became the scene of a long and doubtful conflict between two generals not unworthy of each other. The skill and perseverance of the Roman at length prevailed: and the Goths, after sustaining a considerable loss from disease and desertion, gradually retreated to the lofty mountain of Pholoe, near the sources of the Peneus, and on the frontiers of Elis; a sacred country, which had formerly been exempted from the calamities of war.[3] The camp of the Barbarians was immediately besieged: the waters of the river[4] were diverted into another channel; and while they laboured under the intolerable pressure of thirst and hunger, a strong line of circumvallation was formed to prevent their escape. After these precautions, Stilicho, too confident of victory, retired to enjoy his triumph, in the theatrical games, and lascivious dances, of the Greeks; his soldiers, deserting their standards, spread themselves over the country of their allies, which they stripped of all that had been saved from the rapacious hands of the enemy. Alaric appears to have seized the favourable moment to execute one of those hardy enterprises, in which the abilities of a general are displayed with more genuine lustre, than in the tumult of a day of battle. To extricate himself from the prison of Peloponnesus, it was necessary that he should pierce the intrenchments which surrounded his camp; that he should perform a difficult and dangerous march of thirty miles, as far as the Gulf of Corinth; and that he should transport his troops, his captives, and his spoil,

[1] Eunap. (Vit. Philosoph. p. 90.) intimates, that a troop of Monks betrayed Greece, and followed the Gothic camp.

[2] For Stilicho's Greek war, compare the honest narrative of Zosimus (l. v. 295.), with the curious circumstantial flattery of Claud. (i. Cons. Stilich. l. i. 172—186. iv. Cons. Hon. 459.). As the event was not glorious, it is artfully thrown into the shade.

[3] The troops who marched through Elis delivered up their arms. This security enriched the Eleans, who were lovers of a rural life. Riches begat pride; they disdained their privilege, and they suffered. Polybius advises them to retire once more within their magic circle. See a learned and judicious discourse on the Olympic games, which Mr. West has prefixed to his translation of Pindar.

[4] Claud. (iv. Cons. Hon. 480.) alludes to the fact, without naming the river: perhaps the Alpheus (i. Cons. Stil. l. i. 185.).

——Et Alpheus Geticis augustus acervis Tardior ad Siculos etiamnum pergit amores.

Yet I should prefer the Peneus, a shallow stream in a wide and deep bed, which runs through Elis, and falls into the sea below Cylenne. It had been joined with the Alpheus to cleanse the Augean stable (Cellarius, i. 760. Chandler's Travels, p. 286.).

over an arm of the sea, which, in the narrow interval between Rhium and the opposite shore, is at least half a mile in breadth.[1] The operations of Alaric must have been secret, prudent, and rapid; since the Roman general was confounded by the intelligence that the Goths, who had eluded his efforts, were in full possession of the important province of Epirus. This unfortunate delay allowed Alaric sufficient time to conclude the treaty, which he secretly negociated, with the ministers of Constantinople. The apprehension of a civil war compelled Stilicho to retire, at the haughty mandate of his rivals, from the dominions of Arcadius; and he respected, in the enemy of Rome, the honourable character of the ally and servant of the emperor of the East.

A Grecian philosopher,[2] who visited Constantinople soon after the death of Theodosius, published his liberal opinions concerning the duties of kings, and the state of the Roman republic (A.D. 398). Synesius observes, and deplores, the fatal abuse, which the imprudent bounty of the late emperor had introduced into the military service. The citizens, and subjects, had purchased an exemption from the indispensable duty of defending their country; which was supported by the arms of Barbarian mercenaries. The fugitives of Scythia were permitted to disgrace the illustrious dignity of the empire; their ferocious youth, who disdained the salutary restraint of laws, were more anxious to acquire the riches, than to imitate the arts, of a people, the object of their contempt and hatred; and the power of the Goths was the stone of Tantalus, perpetually suspended over the peace and safety of the devoted state. The measures, which Synesius recommends, are the dictates of a bold and generous patriot. He exhorts the emperor to revive the courage of his subjects, by the example of manly virtue; to banish luxury from the court, and from the camp; to substitute, in the place of the Barbarian mercenaries, an army of men interested in the defence of their laws and of their property; to force, in such a moment of public danger, the mechanic from his shop, and the philosopher from his school; to rouse the indolent citizen from his dream of pleasure, and to arm, for the protection of agriculture, the hands of the laborious husbandman. At the head of such troops, who might deserve the name, and would display the spirit, of Romans, he animates the son of Theodosius to encounter a race of Barbarians, who were destitute of any real courage; and never to lay down his arms, till he had chased them far away into the solitudes of Scythia; or had reduced them to the state of ignominious servitude, which the Lacedæmonians formerly imposed on the captive Helots.—*Synesius de Regno*, p. 21—26. The court of Arcadius indulged the zeal, applauded the eloquence, and neglected the advice, of Synesius. Perhaps the philosopher, who addresses the emperor of the East, in the language of reason and virtue,

[1] Strabo, l. viii. 517. Plin. Hist. Natur. iv. 3. Wheeler, p. 308. Chandler, p. 275. They measured, from different points, the distance between the two lands.

[2] Synesius passed three years (A.D. 397—400.) at Constantinople, as deputy from Cyrene to the emperor Arcadius. He presented him with a crown of gold, and pronounced before him the instructive oration de Regno (p. 1—32. ed. Petav. Paris, 1612.). The philosopher was made bishop of Ptolemais, A.D. 410, and died about 430. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xii. 499. 554. 683—685.

which he might have used to a Spartan king, had not condescended to form a practicable scheme, consistent with the temper, and circumstances, of a degenerate age. Perhaps the pride of the ministers, whose business was seldom interrupted by reflection, might reject, as wild and visionary, every proposal, which exceeded the measure of their capacity, and deviated from the forms and precedents of office. While the oration of Synesius, and the downfall of the Barbarians, were the topics of popular conversation, an edict was published at Constantinople, which declared the promotion of Alaric to the rank of master-general of the Eastern Illyricum. The Roman provincials, and the allies, who had respected the faith of treaties, were justly indignant, that the ruin of Greece and Epirus should be so liberally rewarded. The Gothic conqueror was received as a lawful magistrate, in the cities which he had so lately besieged. The fathers, whose sons he had massacred, the husbands, whose wives he had violated, were subject to his authority: and the success of his rebellion encouraged the ambition of every leader of the foreign mercenaries. The use to which Alaric applied his new command, distinguishes the firm and judicious character of his policy. He issued his orders to the four magazines and manufactures of offensive and defensive arms, Margus, Ratiaria, Naissus, and Thessalonica, to provide his troops with an extraordinary supply of shields, helmets, swords, and spears; the unhappy provincials were compelled to forge the instruments of their own destruction; and the Barbarians removed the only defect which had sometimes disappointed the efforts of their courage.[1] The birth of Alaric, the glory of his past exploits, and the confidence in his future designs, insensibly united the body of the nation under his victorious standard; and, with the unanimous consent of the Barbarian chieftains, the master-general of Illyricum was elevated, according to ancient custom, on a shield, and solemnly proclaimed king of the Visigoths.[2] Armed with this double power, seated on the verge of the two empires, he alternately sold his deceitful promises to the courts of Arcadius, and Honorius;[3] till he declared and executed his resolution of invading the dominions of the West. The provinces of Europe which belonged to the Eastern emperor, were already exhausted; those of Asia were inaccessible; and the strength of Constantinople had resisted his attack. But he was tempted by the fame, the beauty, the wealth of Italy, which he had twice visited; and he secretly aspired to plant the Gothic standard on the walls of Rome, and to enrich his army with the accumulated spoils of three hundred triumphs.[4]

[1] ——— qui fœdera rumpit
Ditatur: qui servat, egat: vastator Achivæ
Gentis, et Epirum nuper populatus inultam
Præsidet Illyrico: jam, quos obsedit, amicos
Ingreditur muros; illis responsa daturus
Quorum conjugibus potitur, natosque peremit.

Claudian in Eutrop. l. ii. 212. Alaric applauds his own policy (de Bell. Getic. 533.), in the use which he had made of this Illyrian jurisdiction.

[2] Jornand. c. 29. p. 651. The Gothic historian adds, with usual spirit. Cum suis deliberans suasit suo labore quærere regna quam alienis per otium subjacere.

[3] ——— Discors odiisque anceps civilibus Orbis
Non sua vis tutata diu, dum fœdera fallax
Ludit, et alternæ perjuria venditat aulæ.
Claudian de Bell. Get. 565.

[4] Alpibus Italiæ ruptis penetrabis ad *Urbem*.
This authentic prediction was announced by Alaric, or at least by Claud. (de Bell. Get. 547.),

The scarcity of facts,[1] and the uncertainty of dates,[2] oppose our attempts to describe the circumstances of the first invasion of Italy by the arms of Alaric. His march, perhaps from Thessalonica, through the warlike and hostile country of Pannonia, as far as the foot of the Julian Alps (A.D. 400—403); his passage of those mountains, which were strongly guarded by troops and intrenchments; the siege of Aquileia, and the conquest of the provinces of Istria and Venetia, appear to have employed a considerable time. Unless his operations were extremely cautious and slow, the length of the interval would suggest a probable suspicion, that the Gothic king retreated towards the banks of the Danube; and reinforced his army with fresh swarms of Barbarians, before he again attempted to penetrate into the heart of Italy. Since the public and important events escape the diligence of the historian, he may amuse himself with contemplating, for a moment, the influence of the arms of Alaric on the fortunes of two obscure individuals, a presbyter of Aquileia, and a husbandman of Verona. The learned Rufinus, who was summoned by his enemies to appear before a Roman synod,[3] wisely preferred the dangers of a besieged city; and the Barbarians, who furiously shook the walls of Aquileia, might save him from the cruel sentence of another heretic, who, at the request of the same bishops, was severely whipped, and condemned to perpetual exile on a desert island.[4] The *old man*,[5] who had passed his simple and innocent life in the neighbourhood of Verona, was a stranger to the quarrels both of kings and bishops; *his* pleasures, his desires, his knowledge, were confined within the little circle of his paternal farm; and a staff supported his aged steps, on the same ground where he had sported in his infancy. Yet even this humble and rustic felicity (which Claudian describes with so much truth and feeling) was still exposed to the undistinguishing rage of war. His trees, his old *contemporary* trees,[6] must blaze in the conflagration of the whole country; a detachment of Gothic cavalry might sweep

seven years before the event. But as it was not accomplished within the term which has been rashly fixed, the interpreters escaped through an ambiguous meaning.

[1] Our best materials are 970 verses of Claudian, in the poem on the Getic war, and the beginning of that which celebrates the sixth consulship of Honorius. Zosimus is totally silent; and we are reduced to such scraps, or rather crumbs, as we can pick from Orosius and the Chronicles.

[2] Notwithstanding the gross errors of Jornandes, who confounds the Italian wars of Alaric (c. 29.), his date of the consulship of Stilicho and Aurelian (A.D. 400.) is firm and respectable. It is certain from Claud. (Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 804.), that the battle of Pollentia was fought A.D. 403; but we cannot easily fill the interval.

[3] Tantum Romanæ urbis judicium fugis, ut magis obsidionem barbaricam, quam *pacatæ* urbis judicium velis sustinere. Jerom. ii. 239. Rufinus understood his own danger: the *peaceful* city was inflamed by the beldam Marcella, and the rest of Jerom's faction.

[4] Jovinian, the enemy of fasts and celibacy, who was persecuted and insulted by the furious Jerom (Jortin's Remarks, iv. 104.). See the original edict of banishment in the Theodosian Code, l. xvi. tit. v. leg. 43.

[5] This epigram (de Sene Veronensi qui suburbium nusquam egressus est) is one of the earliest and most pleasing compositions of Claudian. Cowley's imitation (Hurd's edition, ii. 241.) has some natural and happy strokes; but it is much inferior to the original portrait, which is evidently drawn from the life.

[6] Ingentem meminit parvo qui germine quercum
Æquævumque videt consenuisse nemus.
A neighbouring wood born with himself he sees,
And loves his old contemporary trees.

In this passage, Cowley is perhaps superior to his original; and the English poet, who was a good botanist, has concealed the *oaks*, under a more general expression.

away his cottage and his family; and the power of Alaric could destroy this happiness, which he was not able either to taste, or to bestow. "Fame," says the poet, "encircling with terror or gloomy wings, "proclaimed the march of the Barbarian army, and filled Italy with "consternation:" the apprehensions of each individual were increased in just proportion to the measure of his fortune: and the most timid, who had already embarked their valuable effects, meditated their escape to the island of Sicily, or the African coast. The public distress was aggravated by the fears and reproaches of superstition.[1] Every hour produced some horrid tale of strange and portentous accidents: the Pagans deplored the neglect of omens, and the interruption of sacrifices; but the Christians still derived some comfort from the powerful intercession of the saints and martyrs.[2]

The emperor Honorius was distinguished, above his subjects, by the pre-eminence of fear, as well as of rank. The pride and luxury in which he was educated, had not allowed him to suspect, that there existed on the earth any power presumptuous enough to invade the repose of the successor of Augustus. The arts of flattery concealed the impending danger, till Alaric approached the palace of Milan. But when the sound of war had awakened the young emperor, instead of flying to arms with the spirit, or even the rashness, of his age, he eagerly listened to those timid counsellors, who proposed to convey his sacred person, and his faithful attendants, to some secure and distant station in the provinces of Gaul (A.D. 403). Stilicho alone[3] had courage and authority to resist this disgraceful measure, which would have abandoned Rome and Italy to the Barbarians; but as the troops of the palace had been lately detached to the Rhætian frontier, and as the source of new levies was slow and precarious, the general of the West could only promise, that, if the court of Milan would maintain their ground during his absence, he would soon return with an army equal to the encounter of the Gothic king. Without losing a moment (while each moment was so important to the public safety), Stilicho hastily embarked on the Larian lake, ascended the mountains of ice and snow, amidst the severity of an Alpine winter, and suddenly repressed, by his unexpected presence, the enemy, who had disturbed the tranquillity of Rhætia.[4] The Barbarians, perhaps some tribes of the Alemanni, respected the firmness of a chief, who still assumed the language of command; and the choice which he condescended to make, of a select number of their bravest youth, was considered as a mark of his esteem and favour. The cohorts, who were delivered from the neighbouring foe, diligently repaired to the Imperial standard; and Stilicho issued his orders to the most remote troops of the West, to advance, by rapid marches, to the defence of Honorius and of Italy.

[1] Claud. de Bell. Get. 199—266. He may seem prolix: but fear and superstition occupied as large a space in the minds of the Italians.

[2] From the passages of Paulinus, which Baronius has produced (Annal. Eccles. A.D. 403, No. 51.), it is manifest, that the general alarm had pervaded all Italy, as far as Nola in Campania, where that famous penitent had fixed his abode.

[3] Solus erat Stilicho, &c. is the exclusive commendation which Claudian bestows (de Bell. Get. 267.), without condescending to except the emperor. How insignificant must Honorius have appeared in his own court!

[4] The face of the counrry, and the hardiness of Stilicho, are finely described (de Bell. Get. 340—363.).

The fortresses of the Rhine were abandoned; and the safety of Gaul was protected only by the faith of the Germans, and the ancient terror of the Roman name. Even the legion, which had been stationed to guard the wall of Britain against the Caledonians of the North, was hastily recalled;[1] and a numerous body of the cavalry of the Alani was persuaded to engage in the service of the emperor, who anxiously expected the return of his general. The prudence and vigour of Stilicho were conspicuous on this occasion, which revealed, at the same time, the weakness of the falling empire. The legions of Rome, which had long since languished in the gradual decay of discipline and courage, were exterminated by the Gothic and civil wars; and it was found impossible, without exhausting and exposing the provinces, to assemble an army for the defence of Italy.

When Stilicho seemed to abandon his sovereign in the unguarded palace of Milan, he had probably calculated the term of his absence, the distance of the enemy, and the obstacles that might retard their march. He principally depended on the rivers of Italy, the Adige, the Mincius, the Oglio, and the Addua; which, in the winter or spring, by the fall of rains, or by the melting of the snows, are commonly swelled into broad and impetuous torrents.[2] But the season happened to be remarkably dry; and the Goths could traverse, without impediment, the wide and stony beds, whose centre was faintly marked by the course of a shallow stream. The bridge and passage of the Addua were secured by a strong detachment of the Gothic army; and as Alaric approached the walls, or rather the suburbs, of Milan, he enjoyed the proud satisfaction of seeing the emperor of the Romans fly before him. Honorius, accompanied by a feeble train of statesmen and eunuchs, hastily retreated towards the Alps, with a design of securing his person in the city of Arles, which had often been the royal residence of his predecessors. But Honorius[3] had scarcely passed the Po, before he was overtaken by the speed of the Gothic cavalry;[4] since the urgency of the danger compelled him to seek a temporary shelter within the fortification of Asta, a town of Liguria or Piedmont, situate on the banks of the Tanarus.[5] The siege of an obscure place, which contained so rich a prize, and seemed incapable of a long resistance, was instantly formed, and indefatigably pressed, by the king of the Goths; and the bold declaration, which the emperor might afterwards make, that his

[1] Venit et extremis legio prætenta Britannis Quæ Scoto dat frena truci.
De Bell. Get. 416.

Yet the most rapid march from Edinburgh, or Newcastle, to Milan, must have required a longer space of time than Claudian seems willing to allow for the duration of the Gothic war.

[2] Every traveller must recollect the face of Lombardy (Fontenelle, v. 279.), which is often tormented by the capricious and irregular abundance of waters. The Austrians, before Genoa, were encamped in the dry bed of the Polcevera. "Ne sarebbe" (says Muratori) "mai passato per mente a quê buoni Alemanni, che quel picciolo torrente potesse, per cosi "dire in un instante cangiarsi in un terribil gigante." (Annal. d'Italia, xvi. 443. Milan, 1753. 8vo. ed.)

[3] Claudian does not clearly answer our question, Where was Honorius himself? Yet the flight is marked by the pursuit: and my idea of the Gothic war is justified by the Italian critics, Sigonius (i. P. ii. 369. de Imp. Occident. l. x.) and Muratori (Annali d'Italia, iv. 45.).

[4] One of the roads may be traced in the Itineraries (p. 98. 288. 294. with Wesseling's notes.) Asta lay some miles on the right hand.

[5] Asta, or Asti, a Roman colony, is now the capital of a pleasant county, which, in the sixteenth century, devolved to the Dukes of Savoy (Leandro Alberti Descrizzione d'Italia, p. 382.).

breast had never been susceptible of fear, did not probably obtain much credit, even in his own court.[1] In the last and almost hopeless extremity, after the Barbarians had already proposed the indignity of a capitulation, the Imperial captive was suddenly relieved by the fame, the approach, and at length the presence of the hero, whom he had so long expected. At the head of a chosen and intrepid vanguard, Stilicho swam the stream of the Addua, to gain the time which he must have lost in the attack of the bridge; the passage of the Po was an enterprise of much less hazard and difficulty; and the successful action, in which he cut his way through the Gothic camp under the walls of Asta, revived the hopes, and vindicated the honour, of Rome. Instead of grasping the fruit of his victory, the Barbarian was gradually invested, on every side, by the troops of the West, who successively issued through all the passes of the Alps; his quarters were straitened; his convoys were intercepted; and the vigilance of the Romans prepared to form a chain of fortifications, and to besiege the lines of the besiegers. A military council was assembled of the long-haired chiefs of the Gothic nation; of aged warriors, whose bodies were wrapped in furs, and whose stern countenances were marked with honourable wounds. They weighed the glory of persisting in their attempt against the advantage of securing their plunder; and they recommended the prudent measure of a seasonable retreat. In this important debate, Alaric displayed the spirit of the conqueror of Rome; and after he had reminded his countrymen of their achievements and of their designs, he concluded his animating speech, by the solemn and positive assurance, that he was resolved to find in Italy, either a kingdom or a grave.[2]

The loose discipline of the Barbarians always exposed them to the danger of a surprise; but, instead of chusing the dissolute hours of riot and intemperance, Stilicho resolved to attack the *Christian* Goths, whilst they were devoutly employed in celebrating the festival of Easter.[3] The execution of the stratagem, or, as it was termed by the clergy, of the sacrilege, was entrusted to Saul, a Barbarian and a Pagan, who had served, however, with distinguished reputation among the veteran generals of Theodosius. The camp of the Goths (A.D. 403. March 29), which Alaric had pitched in the neighbourhood of Pollentia,[4] was thrown into confusion by the sudden and impetuous charge of the Imperial cavalry; but, in a few moments, the undaunted genius of their leader gave them an order, and a field, of battle; and as soon as they had recovered from their astonishment, the pious confidence,

[1] Nec me timor impulit ullus. He might hold this proud language the next year at Rome, 500 miles from the scene of danger (vi. Cons. Hon. 449.).

[2] Hanc ego vel victor regno, vel morte tenebo Victus, humum———

The speeches (de Bell. Get. 479—549.) of the Gothic Nestor, and Achilles, are strong, characteristic, adapted to the circumstances; and possibly not less genuine than those of Livy.

[3] Orosius (l. vii. c. 37.) is shocked at the impiety of the Romans, who attacked, on Easter Sunday, such pious Christians. Yet, at the same time, public prayers were offered at the shrine of St. Thomas of Edessa, for the destruction of the Arian robber. Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 529.), who quotes an homily, which has been erroneously ascribed to St. Chrysostom.

[4] The vestiges of Pollentia are 25 miles S.E. of Turin. *Urbs*, in the same neighbourhood, was a royal chace of the kings of Lombardy, and a small river, which excused the prediction, "penetrabis ad urbem." (Cluver. Ital. Antiq. i. 83.)

that the God of the Christians would assert their cause, added new strength to their native valour. In this engagement, which was long maintained with equal courage and success, the chief of the Alani, whose diminutive and savage form concealed a magnanimous soul, approved his suspected loyalty, by the zeal with which he fought, and fell, in the service of the republic; and the fame of this gallant Barbarian has been imperfectly preserved in the verses of Claudian, since the poet, who celebrates his virtue, has omitted the mention of his name. His death was followed by the flight and dismay of the squadrons which he commanded; and the defeat of the wing of cavalry might have decided the victory of Alaric, if Stilicho had not immediately led the Roman and Barbarian infantry to the attack. The skill of the general, and the bravery of the soldiers, surmounted every obstacle. In the evening of the bloody day, the Goths retreated from the field of battle; the intrenchments of their camp were forced, and the scene of rapine and slaughter made some atonement for the calamities which they had inflicted on the subjects of the empire.[1] The magnificent spoils of Corinth and Argos enriched the veterans of the West; the captive wife of Alaric, who had impatiently claimed his promise of Roman jewels and Patrician handmaids,[2] was reduced to implore the mercy of the insulting foe; and many thousand prisoners, released from the Gothic chains, dispersed through the provinces of Italy the praises of their heroic deliverer. The triumph of Stilicho[3] was compared by the poet, and perhaps by the public, to that of Marius; who, in the same part of Italy, had encountered and destroyed another army of northern Barbarians. The huge bones, and the empty helmets, of the Cimbri and of the Goths, would easily be confounded by succeeding generations; and posterity might erect a common trophy to the memory of the two most illustrious generals who had vanquished, on the same memorable ground, the two most formidable enemies of Rome.[4]

The eloquence of Claudian[5] has celebrated, with lavish applause, the victory of Pollentia, one of the most glorious days in the life of his patron; but his reluctant and partial muse bestows more genuine praise on the character of the Gothic king. His name is indeed branded with the reproachful epithets of pirate and robber, to which the conquerors of every age are so justly entitled; but the poet of Stilicho

[1] Orosius wishes, in doubtful words, to insinuate the defeat of the Romans. "Pugnantes "vicimus, victores victi sumus." Prosper (Chron.) makes it an equal and bloody battle; but the Gothic writers Cassiodorus (Chron.) and Jornandes (de Reb. Get. c. 29.) claim a decisive victory.

[2] Demens Ausonidum gemmata monilia matrum,
Romanasque alta famulas cervice petebat.
De Bell. Get. 627.

[3] Claud. (de Bell. Get. 580—647.) and Prudentius (Symmach. l. ii. 694.) celebrate, without ambiguity, the Roman victory of Pollentia. They are poetical and party writers; yet some credit is due to the most suspicious witnesses, who are checked by the recent notoriety of facts.

[4] Claudian's peroration is strong and elegant; but the identity of the Cimbric and Gothic fields, must be understood (like Virgil's Philippi, Georgic i. 490.) according to the loose geography of a poet. Vercellæ and Pollentia are sixty miles from each other; and the latitude is still greater, if the Cimbri were defeated in the wide and barren plain of Verona (Maffei, Verona Illustrata, P. i. 54.).

[5] Claudian and Prudentius must be strictly examined, to reduce the figures, and extort the historic sense of those poets.

is compelled to acknowledge, that Alaric possessed the invincible temper of mind, which rises superior to every misfortune, and derives new resources from adversity. After the total defeat of his infantry, he escaped, or rather withdrew, from the field of battle, with the greatest part of his cavalry entire and unbroken. Without wasting a moment to lament the irreparable loss of so many brave companions, he left his victorious enemy to bind in chains the captive images of a Gothic king;[1] and boldly resolved to break through the unguarded passes of the Apennine, to spread desolation over the fruitful face of Tuscany, and to conquer or die before the gates of Rome. The capital was saved by the active and incessant diligence of Stilicho: but he respected the despair of his enemy; and, instead of committing the fate of the republic to the chance of another battle, he proposed to purchase the absence of the Barbarians. The spirit of Alaric would have rejected such terms, the permission of a retreat, and the offer of a pension, with contempt and indignation; but he exercised a limited and precarious authority over the independent chieftains, who had raised him, for *their* service, above the rank of his equals; they were still less disposed to follow an unsuccessful general, and many of them were tempted to consult their interest by a private negociation with the minister of Honorius. The king submitted to the voice of his people, ratified the treaty with the empire of the West, and repassed the Po, with the remains of the flourishing army which he had led into Italy. A considerable part of the Roman forces still continued to attend his motions; and Stilicho, who maintained a secret correspondence with some of the Barbarian chiefs, was punctually apprised of the designs that were formed in the camp and council of Alaric. The king of the Goths, ambitious to signalize his retreat by some splendid achievement, had resolved to occupy the important city of Verona, which commands the principal passage of the Rhætian Alps; and, directing his march through the territories of those German tribes, whose alliance would restore his exhausted strength, to invade, on the side of the Rhine, the wealthy and unsuspecting provinces of Gaul. Ignorant of the treason, which had already betrayed his bold and judicious enterprise, he advanced towards the passes of the mountains, already possessed by the Imperial troops; where he was exposed, almost at the same instant, to a general attack in the front, on his flanks, and in the rear. In this bloody action, at a small distance from the walls of Verona, the loss of the Goths was not less heavy than that which they had sustained in the defeat of Pollentia; and their valiant king, who escaped by the swiftness of his horse, must either have been slain or made prisoner, if the hasty rashness of the Alani had not disappointed the measures of the Roman general. Alaric secured the remains of his army on the adjacent rocks; and prepared himself, with undaunted resolution, to maintain a siege against the superior numbers of the enemy, who invested him on all sides. But he could not oppose the destructive progress of hunger and disease; nor was it possible for

[1] Et gravant en airain ses frêles avantages De mes etats conquis enchainer les images.
The practice of exposing in triumph the images of kings and provinces, was familiar to the Romans. The bust of Mithridates himself was twelve feet high, of massy gold (Freinshem. Supplement Livian. ciii. 47.).

him to check the continual desertion of his impatient and capricious Barbarians. In this extremity he still found resources in his own courage, or in the moderation of his adversary; and the retreat of the Gothic king was considered as the deliverance of Italy.[1] Yet the people, and even the clergy, incapable of forming any rational judgment of the business of peace and war, presumed to arraign the policy of Stilicho, who so often vanquished, so often surrounded, and so often dismissed the implacable enemy of the republic. The first moment of the public safety is devoted to gratitude and joy; but the second is diligently occupied by envy and calumny.[2]

The citizens of Rome had been astonished by the approach of Alaric; and the diligence with which they laboured to restore the walls of the capital, confessed their own fears, and the decline of the empire. After the retreat of the Barbarians, Honorius was directed to accept the dutiful invitation of the senate, and to celebrate, in the Imperial city, the auspicious æra of the Gothic victory, and of his sixth consulship[3] (A.D. 404). The suburbs and the streets, from the Milvian bridge to the Palatine mount, were filled by the Roman people, who, in the space of an hundred years, had only thrice been honoured with the presence of their sovereigns. While their eyes were fixed on the chariot where Stilicho was deservedly seated by the side of his royal pupil, they applauded the pomp of a triumph, which was not stained, like that of Constantine, or of Theodosius, with civil blood. The procession passed under a lofty arch, which had been purposely erected: but in less than seven years, the Gothic conquerors of Rome might read, if they were able to read, the superb inscription of that monument, which attested the total defeat and destruction of their nation.[4] The emperor resided several months in the capital, and every part of his behaviour was regulated with care to conciliate the affection of the clergy, the senate, and the people of Rome. The clergy was edified by his frequent visits, and liberal gifts, to the shrines of the apostles. The senate, who, in the triumphal procession, had been excused from the humiliating ceremony of preceding on foot the Imperial chariot, was treated with the decent reverence which Stilicho always affected for that assembly. The people was repeatedly gratified by the attention and courtesy of Honorius in the public games, which were celebrated on that occasion with a magnificence not unworthy of the spectator. As soon as the appointed number of chariot-races was concluded, the decoration of the Circus was suddenly changed; the hunting of wild beasts afforded a various and splendid entertainment; and the chace was succeeded by a military dance, which seems, in the lively description of Claudian, to present the image of a modern tournament.

In these games of Honorius, the inhuman combats of gladiators[5]

[1] The Getic war and the sixth consulship of Honorius, obscurely connect the events of Alaric's retreat and losses.

[2] Taceo de Alarico . . . sæpe victo, sæpe concluso, semperque dimisso. Orosius, l. vii. c. 37. p. 567. Claudian (vi. Cons. Hon. 320.) drops the curtain with a fine image.

[3] The remainder of Claudian's poem on the sixth consulship of Honorius, describes the journey, the triumph, and the games (330—660.).

[4] See the inscription in Mascow's History of the Ancient Germans, viii. 12. The words are positive and indiscreet, Getarum nationem in omne ævum domitam, &c.

[5] On the curious, though horrid, subject of the gladiators, consult the two books of the

polluted, for the last time, the amphitheatre of Rome. The first Christian emperor may claim the honour of the first edict, which condemned the art and amusement of shedding human blood;[1] but this benevolent law expressed the wishes of the prince, without reforming an inveterate abuse, which degraded a civilized nation below the condition of savage cannibals. Several hundred, perhaps several thousand, victims were annually slaughtered in the great cities of the empire; and the month of December, more particularly devoted to the combats of gladiators, still exhibited, to the eyes of the Roman people, a grateful spectacle of blood and cruelty. Amidst the general joy of the victory of Pollentia, a Christian poet exhorted the emperor to extirpate, by his authority, the horrid custom which had so long resisted the voice of humanity and religion.[2] The pathetic representations of Prudentius were less effectual than the generous boldness of Telemachus, an Asiatic monk, whose death was more useful to mankind than his life.[3] The Romans were provoked by the interruption of their pleasures; and the rash monk, who had descended into the arena, to separate the gladiators, was overwhelmed under a shower of stones, But the madness of the people soon subsided; they respected the memory of Telemachus, who had deserved the honours of martyrdom; and they submitted, without a murmur, to the laws of Honorius, which abolished for ever the human sacrifices of the amphitheatre. The citizens, who adhered to the manners of their ancestors, might perhaps insinuate, that the last remains of a martial spirit were preserved in this school of fortitude, which accustomed the Romans to the sight of blood, and to the contempt of death: a vain and cruel prejudice, so nobly confuted by the valour of ancient Greece, and of modern Europe![4]

The recent danger, to which the person of the emperor had been exposed in the defenceless palace of Milan, urged him (A.D. 404) to seek a retreat in some inaccessible fortress of Italy, where he might securely remain, while the open country was covered by a deluge of Barbarians. On the coast of the Hadriatic, about ten or twelve miles from the most southern of the seven mouths of the Po, the Thessalians had founded the ancient colony of RAVENNA[5]; which they afterwards resigned to the natives of Umbria. Augustus, who had observed the opportunity of the place, prepared, at the distance of three miles from

Saturnalia of Lipsius, who, as an *antiquarian*, is inclined to excuse the practice of *antiquity* (tom. iii. 483.).

[1] Cod. Theodos. l. xv. tit. xii. leg. 1. The Commentary of Godefroy affords large materials (v. 396.) for the history of gladiators.

[2] See the peroration of Prudentius (in Symmach. l. ii. 1121.), who had doubtless read the eloquent invective of Lactantius (Divin. Institut. l. vi. c. 20.). The Christian apologists have not spared these bloody games, which were introduced in the religious festivals of Paganism.

[3] Theodoret, l. v. c. 26. I wish to believe the story of St. Telemachus. Yet no church has been dedicated, no altar has been erected, to the only monk who died a martyr in the cause of humanity.

[4] Crudele gladiatorum spectaculum et inhumanum *nonnullis* videri solet; et *haud scio* an ita sit, ut nunc fit. Cicero Tusculan. ii. 17. He faintly censures the *abuse*, and warmly defends the *use*, of these sports; oculis nulla poterat esse fortior contra dolorem et mortem disciplina. Seneca (epist. vii.) shows the feelings of a man.

[5] This account of Ravenna is drawn from Strabo (l. v. p. 327.), Pliny (iii. 20.), Stephen of Byzantium (sub voce Ῥάβεννα, p. 651. ed. Berkel.), Claud. (in vi. Cons. Honor. 494.), Sidonius Apollinaris (l. i. epist. v. 8.), Jornan. (de Reb. Get. c. 29.), Procop. (de Bell. Gothic. l. i. c. i. p. 309. ed. Louvre), and Cluverius (Ital. Antiq. i. 301.). Yet I still want a local antiquarian, and a good topographical map.

the old town, a capacious harbour, for the reception of two hundred and fifty ships of war. This naval establishment, which included the arsenals and magazines, the barracks of the troops, and the houses of the artificers, derived its origin and name from the permanent station of the Roman fleet; the intermediate space was soon filled with buildings and inhabitants, and the three extensive and populous quarters of Ravenna gradually contributed to form one of the most important cities of Italy. The principal canal of Augustus poured a copious stream of the waters of the Po through the midst of the city, to the entrance of the harbour; the same waters were introduced into the profound ditches that encompassed the walls; they were distributed, by a thousand subordinate canals, into every part of the city, which they divided into a variety of small islands; the communication was maintained only by the use of the boats and bridges; and the houses of Ravenna, whose appearance may be compared to that of Venice, were raised on the foundation of wooden piles. The adjacent country, to the distance of many miles, was a deep and impassable morass; and the artificial causeway, which connected Ravenna with the continent, might be easily guarded or destroyed, on the approach of an hostile army. These morasses were interspersed, however, with vineyards; and though the soil was exhausted by four or five crops, the town enjoyed a more plentiful supply of wine than of fresh water.[1] The air, instead of receiving the sickly, and almost pestilential, exhalations of low and marshy grounds, was distinguished, like the neighbourhood of Alexandria, as uncommonly pure and salubrious; and this singular advantage was ascribed to the regular tides of the Hadriatic, which swept the canals, interrupted the unwholesome stagnation of the waters, and floated, every day, the vessels of the adjacent country into the heart of Ravenna. The gradual retreat of the sea has left the modern city at the distance of four miles from the Hadriatic; and as early as the fifth or sixth century of the Christian æra, the port of Augustus was converted into pleasant orchards; and a lonely grove of pines covered the ground where the Roman fleet once rode at anchor.[2] Even this alteration contributed to increase the natural strength of the place; and the shallowness of the water was a sufficient barrier against the large ships of the enemy. This advantageous situation was fortified by art and labour; and in the twentieth year of his age, the emperor of the West, anxious only for his personal safety, retired to the perpetual confinement of the walls and morasses of Ravenna. The example of Honorius was imitated by his feeble successors, the Gothic kings, and afterwards the Exarchs, who occupied the throne and palace of the emperors; and, till the middle of the

[1] Martial (epigram iii. 56.) plays on the trick of the knave, who had sold him wine instead of water; but he seriously declares, that a cistern at Ravenna is more valuable than a vineyard. Sidonius complains that the town is destitute of fountains and aqueducts; and ranks the want of fresh water among the local evils, such as the croaking of frogs, the stinging of gnats, &c.

[2] The fable of Theodore and Honoria, which Dryden has so admirably transplanted from Bocaccio (Giornata iii. novell. viii.) was acted in the wood of *Chiassi*, a corrupt word from *Classis*, the naval station, which, with the intermediate road or suburb, the *Via Cæsaris*, constituted the *triple* city of Ravenna.

eighth century, Ravenna was considered as the seat of government, and the capital of Italy.[1]

The fears of Honorius were not without foundation, nor were his precautions without effect. While Italy rejoiced in her deliverance from the Goths (A.D. 400), a furious tempest was excited among the nations of Germany, who yielded to the irresistible impulse, that appears to have been gradually communicated from the eastern extremity of the continent of Asia. The Chinese annals, as they have been interpreted by the learned industry of the present age, may be usefully applied to reveal the secret and remote causes of the fall of the Roman empire. The extensive territory to the north of the great wall, was possessed, after the flight of the Huns, by the victorious Sienpi; who were sometimes broken into independent tribes, and sometimes re-united under a supreme chief; till at length styling themselves *Topa*, or masters of the earth, they acquired a more solid consistence, and a more formidable power. The Topa soon compelled the pastoral nations of the eastern desert to acknowledge the superiority of their arms; they invaded China in a period of weakness and intestine discord; and these fortunate Tartars, adopting the laws and manners of the vanquished people, founded an Imperial dynasty, which reigned near one hundred and sixty years over the northern provinces of the monarchy. Some generations before they ascended the throne of China, one of the Topa princes had enlisted in his cavalry a slave of the name of Moko, renowned for his valour; but who was tempted, by the fear of punishment, to desert his standard, and to range the desert at the head of an hundred followers. This gang of robbers and outlaws swelled into a camp, a tribe, a numerous people, distinguished by the appellation of *Geougen;* and their hereditary chieftains, the posterity of Moko the slave, assumed their rank among the Scythian monarchs. The youth of Toulun, the greatest of his descendants, was exercised by those misfortunes which are the school of heroes. He bravely struggled with adversity, broke the imperious yoke of the Topa, and became the legislator of his nation, and the conqueror of Tartary. His troops were distributed into regular bands of an hundred and of a thousand men; cowards were stoned to death; the most splendid honours were proposed as the reward of valour; and Toulun, who had knowledge enough to despise the learning of China, adopted only such arts and institutions as were favourable to the military spirit of his government. His tents, which he removed in the winter season to a more southern latitude, were pitched, during the summer, on the fruitful banks of the Selinga. His conquests stretched from Corea far beyond the river Irtish. He vanquished, in the country to the North of the Caspian sea, the nation of the *Huns;* and the new title of *Khan*, or *Cagan*, expressed the fame and power which he derived from this memorable victory.[2]

The chain of events is interrupted, or rather is concealed, as it passes from the Volga to the Vistula, through the dark interval which

[1] From the year 404, the dates of the Theod. Code become sedentary at Constantinople and Ravenna. Godefroy's Chronology of the Laws, i. cxlviii.

[2] M. de Guignes, Hist. des Huns, i. 179. ii. 295. 334.

separates the extreme limits of the Chinese, and of the Roman, geography. Yet the temper of the Barbarians, and the experience of successive emigrations sufficiently declare, that the Huns, who were oppressed by the arms of the Geougen, soon withdrew from the presence of an insulting victor. The countries towards the Euxine were already occupied by their kindred tribes; and their hasty flight, which they soon converted into a bold attack, would more naturally be directed towards the rich and level plains, through which the Vistula gently flows into the Baltic sea. The North must again have been alarmed, and agitated, by the invasion of the Huns; and the nations who retreated before them, must have pressed with incumbent weight on the confines of Germany.[1] The inhabitants of those regions, which the ancients have assigned to the Suevi, the Vandals, and the Burgundians, might embrace the resolution of abandoning to the fugitives of Sarmatia, their woods and morasses; or at least of discharging their superfluous numbers on the provinces of the Roman empire.[2] About four years after the victorious Toulun had assumed the title of Khan of the Geougen, another Barbarian, the haughty Rhodogast, or Radagaisus,[3] marched (A.D. 405), from the northern extremities of Germany almost to the gates of Rome, and left the remains of his army to achieve the destruction of the West. The Vandals, the Suevi, and the Burgundians, formed the strength of this mighty host; but the Alani, who had found an hospitable reception in their new seats, added their active cavalry to the heavy infantry of the Germans; and the Gothic adventurers crowded so eagerly to the standard of Radagaisus, that, by some historians, he has been styled the King of the Goths. Twelve thousand warriors, distinguished above the vulgar by their noble birth, or their valiant deeds, glittered in the van;[4] and the whole multitude, which was not less than two hundred thousand fighting men, might be increased, by the accession of women, of children, and of slaves, to the amount of four hundred thousand persons. This formidable emigration issued from the same coast of the Baltic, which had poured forth the myriads of the Cimbri and Teutones, to assault Rome and Italy in the vigour of the republic. After the departure of those Barbarians, their native country, which was marked by the vestiges of their greatness, long ramparts and gigantic moles (*Tacit. de Moribus German.* c. 37), remained, during some ages, a vast and dreary solitude; till the human species was renewed by the powers of generation, and the vacancy was filled by the influx of new inhabitants. The nations who now usurp an extent of land,

[1] Procop. (de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. iii. 182.) has observed an emigration from the Palus Mæotis to the north of Germany, which he ascribes to famine. But his views of ancient history are strangely darkened by ignorance and error.

[2] Zosimus (l. v. 331.) uses the general description of the nations beyond the Danube and the Rhine. Their situation, and consequently their names, are manifestly shown, even in the various epithets which each ancient writer may have casually added.

[3] The name of Rhadagast was that of a local deity of the Obotrites (in Mecklenburgh). A hero might naturally assume the appellation of his tutelar god; but it is not probable that the Barbarians should worship an unsuccessful hero. Mascou, Hist. of the Germans, viii. 14.

[4] Olympiod. (apud Photium, p. 180.) uses the Greek word, Οπτιματοι; which does not convey any precise idea. I suspect that they were the princes and nobles, with their faithful companions; the knights with their 'squires, as they would have been styled some centuries afterwards,

which they are unable to cultivate, would soon be assisted by the industrious poverty of their neighbours, if the government of Europe did not protect the claims of dominion and property.

The correspondence of nations was, in that age, so imperfect and precarious, that the revolutions of the North might escape the knowledge of the court of Ravenna; till the dark cloud, which was collected along the coast of the Baltic, burst in thunder upon the banks of the upper Danube (A.D. 406). The emperor of the West, if his ministers disturbed his amusements by the news of the impending danger, was satisfied with being the occasion, and the spectator of the war.[1] The safety of Rome was entrusted to the counsels, and the sword, of Stilicho; but such was the feeble and exhausted state of the empire, that it was impossible to restore the fortifications of the Danube, or to prevent, by a vigorous effort, the invasion of the Germans.[2] The hopes of the vigilant minister of Honorius were confined to the defence of Italy. He once more abandoned the provinces, recalled the troops, pressed the new levies, which were rigorously exacted, and pusillanimously eluded; employed the most efficacious means to arrest, or allure, the deserters; and offered the gift of freedom, and of two pieces of gold, to all the slaves who would enlist.[3] By these efforts he painfully collected, from the subjects of a great empire, an army of thirty or forty thousand men, which, in the days of Scipio or Camillus, would have been instantly furnished by the free citizens of the territory of Rome.[4] The thirty legions of Stilicho were reinforced by a large body of Barbarian auxiliaries; the faithful Alani were personally attached to his service; and the troops of Huns and of Goths, who marched under the banners of their native princes, Huldin and Sarus, were animated by interest and resentment to oppose the ambition of Radagaisus. The king of the confederate Germans passed, without resistance, the Alps, the Po, and the Apennine; leaving on one hand the inaccessible palace of Honorius, securely buried among the marshes of Ravenna; and, on the other, the camp of Stilicho, who had fixed his head-quarters at Ticinum, or Pavia, but who seems to have avoided a decisive battle, till he had assembled his distant forces. Many cities of Italy were pillaged, or destroyed; and the siege of Florence,[5] by

1 ——————Cujus agendi Spectator vel causa fui.
Claudian, vi. Cons. Hon. 439.

is the modest language of Honorius, in speaking of the Gothic war, which he had seen somewhat nearer.

2 Zos. (l. v. 331.) transports the war, and the victory of Stilicho, beyond the Danube. A strange error, which is awkwardly and imperfectly cured, by reading Αρνου for Ιστρου (Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 807.). In good policy, we must use the service of Zosimus, without esteeming or trusting him.

3 Codex Theod. l. vii. tit. xiii. leg. 16. The date of this law (A.D. 406, May 18.) satisfies me, as it had done Godefroy (ii. 387.), of the true year of the invasion of Radagaisus. Tillemont, Pagi, and Muratori, prefer the preceding year; but they are bound, by certain obligations of civility and respect, to St. Paulinus of Nola.

4 Soon after Rome had been taken by the Gauls, the senate, on a sudden emergency, armed ten legions, 3000 horse, and 42,000 foot; a force which the city could not have sent forth under Augustus (Livy, vii. 25.). This declaration may puzzle an antiquary, but it is clearly explained by Montesquieu.

5 Machiavel has explained, at least as a philosopher, the origin of Florence, which insensibly descended, for the benefit of trade, from the rock of Fæsulæ to the banks of the Arno (Istoria Florentin. i. l. ii. 36. Londra, 1747.). The Triumvirs sent a colony to Florence, which, under Tiberius (Tacit. Annal. i. 79.), deserved the reputation and name of a *flourishing* city. Cluver. Ital. Antiq. i. 507.

Radagaisus, is one of the earliest events in the history of that celebrated republic; whose firmness checked and delayed the unskilful fury of the Barbarians. The senate and people trembled at their approach within an hundred and eighty miles of Rome; and anxiously compared the danger which they had escaped, with the new perils to which they were exposed. Alaric was a Christian and a soldier, the leader of a disciplined army; who understood the laws of war, who respected the sanctity of treaties, and who had familiarly conversed with the subjects of the empire in the same camps, and the same churches. The savage Radagaisus was a stranger to the manners, the religion, and even the language, of the civilized nations of the South. The fierceness of his temper was exasperated by cruel superstition; and it was universally believed, that he had bound himself by a solemn vow, to reduce the city into a heap of stones and ashes, and to sacrifice the most illustrious of the Roman senators, on the altars of those gods, who were appeased by human blood. The public danger, which should have reconciled all domestic animosities, displayed the incurable madness of religious faction. The oppressed votaries of Jupiter and Mercury respected, in the implacable enemy of Rome, the character of a devout Pagan; loudly declared, that they were more apprehensive of the sacrifices, than of the arms, of Radagaisus; and secretly rejoiced in the calamities of their country, which condemned the faith of their Christian adversaries.[1]

Florence was reduced to the last extremity; and the fainting courage of the citizens was supported only by the authority of St. Ambrose; who had communicated, in a dream, the promise of a speedy deliverance.[2] On a sudden they beheld, from their walls, the banners of Stilicho, who advanced, with his united force, to the relief of the faithful city; and who soon marked that fatal spot for the grave of the Barbarian host (A.D. 406). The apparent contradictions of those writers who variously relate the defeat of Radagaisus, may be reconciled, without offering much violence to their respective testimonies. Orosius and Augustin, who were intimately connected by friendship and religion, ascribe this miraculous victory to the providence of God, rather than to the valour of man.[3] They strictly exclude every idea of chance, or even of bloodshed; and positively affirm, that the Romans, whose camp was the scene of plenty and idleness, enjoyed the distress of the Barbarians, slowly expiring on the sharp and barren ridge of the hills of Fæsulæ, which rise above the city of Florence. Their extravagant assertion, that not a single soldier of the Christian army was killed, or even wounded, may be dismissed with silent contempt; but the rest of the narrative of Augustin and Orosius is con-

[1] Yet the Jupiter of Radagaisus, who worshipped Thor and Woden, was very different from the Olympic or Capitoline Jove. The accommodating temper of Polytheism might unite those various and remote deities; but the genuine Romans abhorred the human sacrifices of Gaul and Germany.

[2] Paulinus (in Vit. Ambros. c. 50.) relates this story, which he received from the mouth of Pansophia herself, a religious matron of Florence. Yet the archbishop soon ceased to take an active part in the business of the world, and never became a popular saint.

[3] August. de Civ. Dei, v. 23. Oros. l. vii. c. 37. p. 567. The two friends wrote in Africa, ten or twelve years after the victory; and their authority is implicitly followed by Isidore of Seville (in Chron. p. 713. edit. Grot.). How many interesting facts might Orosius have inserted in the vacant space which is devoted to pious nonsense!

sistent with the state of the war, and the character of Stilicho. Conscious that he commanded the *last* army of the republic, his prudence would not expose it, in the open field, to the headstrong fury of the Germans. The method of surrounding the enemy with strong lines of circumvallation, which he had twice employed against the Gothic king, was repeated on a larger scale, and with more considerable effect. The examples of Cæsar must have been familiar to the most illiterate of the Roman warriors; and the fortifications of Dyrrachium, which connected twenty-four castles, by a perpetual ditch and rampart of fifteen miles, afforded the model of an intrenchment which might confine, and starve, the most numerous host of Barbarians.[1] The Roman troops had less degenerated from the industry, than from the valour, of their ancestors; and if the servile and laborious work offended the pride of the soldiers, Tuscany could supply many thousand peasants, who would labour, though, perhaps, they would not fight, for the salvation of their native country. The imprisoned multitude of horses and men[2] was gradually destroyed by famine, rather than by the sword; but the Romans were exposed, during the progress of such an extensive work, to the frequent attacks of an impatient enemy. The despair of the hungry Barbarians would precipitate them against the fortifications of Stilicho; the general might sometimes indulge the ardour of his brave auxiliaries, who eagerly pressed to assault the camp of the Germans; and these various incidents might produce the sharp and bloody conflicts which dignify the narrative of Zosimus, and the Chronicles of Prosper and Marcellinus.[3] A seasonable supply of men and provisions had been introduced into the walls of Florence; and the famished host of Radagaisus was in its turn besieged. The proud monarch of so many warlike nations, after the loss of his bravest warriors, was reduced to confide either in the faith of a capitulation, or in the clemency of Stilicho.[4] But the death of the royal captive, who was ignominiously beheaded, disgraced the triumph of Rome and of Christianity; and the short delay of his execution was sufficient to brand the conqueror with the guilt of cool and deliberate cruelty.[5] The famished Germans, who escaped the fury of the auxiliaries, were sold as slaves, at the contemptible price of as many single pieces of gold: but the difference of food and climate swept away great numbers of those unhappy strangers; and it was observed, that the inhuman pur-

[1] Franguntur montes, planumque per ardua Cæsar
Ducit opus: pandit fossas, turritaque summis
Disponit castella jugis, magnoque recessû
Amplexus fines; saltus nemorosaque tesqua
Et silvas, vastâque feras indagine claudit.

Yet the simplicity of truth (Cæsar, de Bell. Civ. iii. 44.) is far greater than the amplifications of Lucan (Pharsal. l. vi. 29.).

[2] The rhetorical expressions of Orosius, "In arido et aspero montis jugo;" "in unum ac "parvum verticem," are not very suitable to the encampment of a great army. But Fæsulæ, only three miles from Florence, might afford space for the head-quarters of Radagaisus, and would be comprehended within the circuit of the Roman lines.

[3] Zos. l. v. 331. and the Chronicles of Prosper and Marcellinus.

[4] Olympiod. (apud Photium, p. 180.) uses an expression (προσηταιρισατο), which would denote a strict and friendly alliance, and render Stilicho still more criminal. The paulisper detentus, deinde interfectus, of Orosius, is sufficiently odious.

[5] Orosius, piously inhuman, sacrifices the king and people, Agag and the Amalekites, without a symptom of compassion. The bloody actor is less detestable than the cool unfeeling historian.

chasers, instead of reaping the fruits of their labour, were soon obliged to provide the expence of their interment. Stilicho informed the emperor and the senate of his success; and deserved, a second time, the glorious title of Deliverer of Italy.[1]

The fame of the victory, and more especially of the miracle, has encouraged a vain persuasion, that the whole army, or rather nation, of Germans, who migrated from the shores of the Baltic, miserably perished under the walls of Florence. Such indeed was the fate of Radagaisus himself, of his brave and faithful companions, and of more than one-third of the various multitude of Sueves and Vandals, of Alani and Burgundians, who adhered to the standard of their general.[2] The union of such an army might excite our surprise, but the causes of separation are obvious and forcible; the pride of birth, the insolence of valour, the jealousy of command, the impatience of subordination, and the obstinate conflict of opinions, of interests, and of passions, among so many kings and warriors, who were untaught to yield, or to obey. After the defeat of Radagaisus, two parts of the German host, which must have exceeded the number of one hundred thousand men, still remained in arms, between the Apennine and the Alps, or between the Alps and the Danube. It is uncertain whether they attempted to revenge the death of their general; but their irregular fury was soon diverted by the prudence and firmness of Stilicho, who opposed their march, and facilitated their retreat; who considered the safety of Rome and Italy as the great object of his care, and who sacrificed, with too much indifference, the wealth and tranquillity of the distant provinces.[3] The Barbarians acquired, from the junction of some Pannonian deserters, the knowledge of the country, and of the roads; and the invasion of Gaul, which Alaric had designed, was executed (A.D. 406. Dec. 31) by the remains of the great army of Radagaisus.[4]

Yet if they expected to derive any assistance from the tribes of Germany who inhabited the banks of the Rhine, their hopes were disappointed. The Alemanni preserved a state of inactive neutrality; and the Franks distinguished their zeal and courage in the defence of the empire. In the rapid progress down the Rhine, which was the first act of the administration of Stilicho, he had applied himself, with peculiar attention, to secure the alliance of the warlike Franks, and to remove the irreconcileable enemies of peace and of the republic. Marcomir, one of their kings, was publicly convicted, before the tri-

[1] And Claudian's muse, was she asleep? had she been ill paid? Methinks the seventh consulship of Honorius (A.D. 407.) would have furnished the subject of a noble poem. Before it was discovered that the state could no longer be saved, Stilicho (after Romulus, Camillus, and Marius) might have been worthily surnamed the fourth founder of Rome.

[2] A luminous passage of Prosper's Chronicle, "*In tres partes, per diversos principes, divisus exercitus*," reduces the miracle of Florence, and connects the history of Italy, Gaul, and Germany.

[3] Orosius and Jerom positively charge him with instigating the invasion. "Excitatæ a Stilichone gentes," &c. They must mean *indirectly*. He saved Italy at the expence of Gaul.

[4] De Buat is satisfied, that the Germans who invaded Gaul were the *two-thirds* that yet remained of the army of Radagaisus. Hist. Anc. des Peup. de l'Eur. (vii. 87. Paris, 1772.); an elaborate work, which I had not the advantage of perusing till the year 1777. As early as 1771, I find the same idea expressed in a rough draught of the present History. I have since observed a similar intimation in Mascou (viii. 15.). Such agreement, without mutual communication, may add some weight to our common sentiment.

bunal of the Roman magistrate, of violating the faith of treaties. He was sentenced to a mild, but distant, exile, in the province of Tuscany; and this degradation of the regal dignity was so far from exciting the resentment of his subjects, that they punished with death the turbulent Sunno, who attempted to revenge his brother; and maintained a dutiful allegiance to the princes, who were established on the throne by the choice of Stilicho.[1] When the limits of Gaul and Germany were shaken by the northern emigration, the Franks bravely encountered the single force of the Vandals; who, regardless of the lessons of adversity, had again separated their troops from the standard of their Barbarian allies. They paid the penalty of their rashness; and twenty thousand Vandals, with their king Godigisclus, were slain in the field of battle. The whole people must have been extirpated, if the squadrons of the Alani, advancing to their relief, had not trampled down the infantry of the Franks; who, after an honourable resistance, were compelled to relinquish the unequal contest. The victorious confederates pursued their march, and on the last day of the year, in a season when the waters of the Rhine were most probably frozen, they entered, without opposition, the defenceless provinces of Gaul. This memorable passage of the Suevi, the Vandals, the Alani, and the Burgundians, who never afterwards retreated, may be considered as the fall of the Roman empire in the countries beyond the Alps; and the barriers, which had so long separated the savage and the civilized nations of the earth, were from that fatal moment levelled with the ground.[2]

While the peace of Germany was secured by the attachment of the Franks, and the neutrality of the Alemanni, the subjects of Rome, unconscious of their approaching calamities, enjoyed the state of quiet and prosperity, which had seldom blessed the frontiers of Gaul. Their flocks and herds were permitted to graze in the pastures of the Barbarians; their huntsmen penetrated, without fear or danger, into the darkest recesses of the Hercynian wood.[3] The banks of the Rhine were crowned, like those of the Tyber, with elegant houses, and well-cultivated farms; and if a poet descended the river, he might express his doubt, on which side was situated the territory of the Romans.[4] This scene of peace and plenty was suddenly changed into a desert; and the prospect of the smoking ruins could alone distinguish the solitude of nature from the desolation of man. The flourishing city

1 ——Provincia missos Quos dederis.
Expellet citius fasces, quam Francia reges

Claud. (i. Cons. Stil. l. i. 235.) is clear and satisfactory. These kings of France are unknown to Gregory of Tours; but the author of the Gesta Francorum mentions both Sunno and Marcomir, and names the latter as the father of Pharamond (in ii. 543.). He seems to write from good materials, which he did not understand.

2 Zos. (l. vi. 373.), Oros. (l. vii. c. 40. p. 576.), and the Chronicles. Greg. of Tours (l. ii. c. 9. p. 165. in the second volume of the Historians of France) has preserved a valuable fragment of Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus, whose three names denote a Christian, a Roman subject, and a Semi-barbarian.

3 Claud. (i. Cons. Stil. l. i. 221. l. ii. 186.) describes the peace and prosperity of the Gallic frontier. Dubos (Hist. Crit. i. 174.) would read *Alba* (a nameless rivulet of the Ardennes) instead of *Albis*; and expatiates on the danger of the Gallic cattle grazing beyond the *Elbe*. Foolish enough! In poetical geography, the Elbe, and the Hercynian, signify any river, or any wood, in Germany. Claudian is not prepared for the strict examination of our antiquaries.

4 ——Geminasque viator Cum videat ripas, quæ sit Romana requirat.

of Mentz was surprised and destroyed; and many thousand Christians were inhumanly massacred in the church. Worms perished after a long and obstinate siege; Strasburg, Spires, Rheims, Tournay, Arras, Amiens, experienced the cruel oppression of the German yoke; and the consuming flames of war spread (A.D. 407, &c.) from the banks of the Rhine over the greatest part of the seventeen provinces of Gaul. That rich and extensive country, as far as the ocean, the Alps, and the Pyrenees, was delivered to the Barbarians, who drove before them, in a promiscuous crowd, the bishop, the senator, and the virgin, laden with the spoils of their houses and altars.[1] The ecclesiastics, to whom we are indebted for this vague description of the public calamities, embraced the opportunity of exhorting the Christians to repent of the sins which had provoked the Divine Justice, and to renounce the perishable goods of a wretched and deceitful world. But as the Pelagian controversy,[2] which attempts to sound the abyss of grace and predestination, soon became the serious employment of the Latin clergy; the Providence which had decreed, or foreseen, or permitted such a train of moral and natural evils, was rashly weighed in the imperfect and fallacious balance of reason. The crimes, and the misfortunes, of the suffering people, were presumptuously compared with those of their ancestors; and they arraigned the Divine Justice, which did not exempt from the common destruction the feeble, the guiltless, the infant portion of the human species. These idle disputants overlooked the invariable laws of nature, which have connected peace with innocence, plenty with industry, and safety with valour. The timid and selfish policy of the court of Ravenna might recall the Palatine legions for the protection of Italy; the remains of the stationary troops might be unequal to the arduous task; and the Barbarian auxiliaries might prefer the unbounded licence of spoil, to the benefits of a moderate and regular stipend. But the provinces of Gaul were filled with a numerous race of hardy and robust youth, who, in the defence of their houses, their families, and their altars, if they had dared to die, would have deserved to vanquish. The knowledge of their native country would have enabled them to oppose continual and insuperable obstacles to the progress of an invader; and the deficiency of the Barbarians, in arms as well as in discipline, removed the only pretence which excuses the submission of a populous country to the inferior numbers of a veteran army. When France was invaded by Charles the Fifth, he inquired of a prisoner, how many *days* Paris might be distant from the frontier; "Perhaps *twelve*, but they will be "days of battle:"[3] such was the gallant answer which checked the arrogance of that ambitious prince. The subjects of Honorius, and those of Francis I., were animated by a very different spirit; and in

[1] Jerom, i. 93. See in the 1st vol. of the Historians of France, p. 777. the proper extracts from the Carmen de Providentiâ Divinâ, and Salvian. The anonymous poet was himself a captive, with his bishop and fellow-citizens.

[2] The Pelagian doctrine, which was first agitated A.D. 405, was condemned, in the space of ten years, at Rome and Carthage. St. Augustin fought and conquered; but the Greek church was favourable to his adversaries; and (what is singular enough) the people did not take any part in a dispute which they could not understand.

[3] Mem. de Guillaume du Bellay, l. vi. In French, the original reproof is less obvious, and more pointed, from the double sense of the word *journée*, which alike signifies, a day's travel, or a battle.

less than two years, the divided troops of the savages of the Baltic, whose numbers, were they fairly stated, would appear contemptible, advanced, without a combat, to the foot of the Pyrenæan mountains.

In the early part of the reign of Honorius, the vigilance of Stilicho had successfully guarded the remote island of Britain from her incessant enemies of the ocean, the mountains, and the Irish coast.[1] But those restless Barbarians could not neglect the fair opportunity of the Gothic war, when the walls and stations of the province were stripped of the Roman troops. If any of the legionaries were permitted to return from the Italian expedition, their faithful report of the court and character of Honorius must have tended to dissolve the bonds of allegiance, and to exasperate the seditious temper of the British army (A.D. 407). The spirit of revolt, which had formerly disturbed the age of Gallienus, was revived by the capricious violence of the soldiers; and the unfortunate, perhaps the ambitious, candidates, who were the objects of their choice, were the instruments, and at length the victims, of their passion.[2] Marcus was the first whom they placed on the throne, as the lawful emperor of Britain, and of the West. They violated, by the hasty murder of Marcus, the oath of fidelity which they had imposed on themselves; and *their* disapprobation of his manners may seem to inscribe an honourable epitaph on his tomb. Gratian was the next whom they adorned with the diadem and the purple; and, at the end of four months, Gratian experienced the fate of his predecessor. The memory of the great Constantine, whom the British legions had given to the church and to the empire, suggested the singular motive of their third choice. They discovered in the ranks a private soldier of the name of Constantine, and their impetuous levity had already seated him on the throne (A.D. 407), before they perceived his incapacity to sustain the weight of that glorious appellation.[3] Yet the authority of Constantine was less precarious, and his government was more successful, than the transient reigns of Marcus and of Gratian. The danger of leaving his inactive troops in those camps, which had been twice polluted with blood and sedition, urged him to attempt the reduction of the Western provinces. He landed at Boulogne with an inconsiderable force; and after he had reposed himself some days, he summoned the cities of Gaul, which had escaped the yoke of the Barbarians, to acknowledge their lawful sovereign. They obeyed the summons without reluctance. The neglect of the court of Ravenna had absolved a deserted people from the duty of allegiance; their actual distress encouraged them to accept any circumstances of change, without apprehension, and, perhaps, with some degree of hope;

[1] Claud. (i. Cons. Stil. l. ii. 250.). It is supposed, that the Scots of Ireland invaded, by sea, the whole western coast of Britain: and some slight credit may be given even to Nennius and the Irish traditions (Carte's Hist. of England, i. 169. Whitaker's Genuine Hist. of the Britons, p. 199.). The sixty-six Lives of St. Patrick, which were extant in the ninth century, must have contained as many thousand lies; yet we may believe, that, in one of these Irish inroads, the future apostle was led away captive (Usher, Antiquit. Eccles. Britann. p. 431. and Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xvi. 456. 782.).

[2] The British usurpers are taken from Zos. (l. vi. 371.), Oros. (l. vii. c. 40. p. 576.), Olympiod. (apud Photium, p. 180.), the ecclesiastical historians, and the Chronicles. The Latins are ignorant of Marcus.

[3] Cum in Constantino *inconstantiam* . . , execrarentur (Sidon. Appollin. l. v. epist. 9. p. 139. ed. secund. Sirmond.). Yet Sidonius might be tempted, by so fair a pun, to stigmatize a prince, who had disgraced his grandfather.

and they might flatter themselves, that the troops, the authority, and even the name of a Roman emperor, who fixed his residence in Gaul, would protect the unhappy country from the rage of the Barbarians. The first successes of Constantine against the detached parties of the Germans, were magnified by the voice of adulation into splendid and decisive victories; which the reunion and insolence of the enemy soon reduced to their just value. His negociations procured a short and precarious truce; and if some tribes of the Barbarians were engaged, by the liberality of his gifts and promises, to undertake the defence of the Rhine, these expensive and uncertain treaties, instead of restoring the pristine vigour of the Gallic frontier, served only to disgrace the majesty of the prince, and to exhaust what yet remained of the treasures of the republic. Elated however with this imaginary triumph, the vain deliverer of Gaul advanced into the provinces of the South, to encounter a more pressing and personal danger. Sarus the Goth was ordered to lay the head of the rebel at the feet of the emperor Honorius; and the forces of Britain and Italy were unworthily consumed in this domestic quarrel. After the loss of his two bravest generals, Justinian and Nevigastes, the former of whom was slain in the field of battle, the latter in a peaceful but treacherous interview, Constantine fortified himself within the walls of Vienna. The place was ineffectually attacked seven days; and the Imperial army supported, in a precipitate retreat, the ignominy of purchasing a secure passage from the freebooters and outlaws of the Alps.[1] Those mountains now separated the dominions of two rival monarchs: and the fortifications of the double frontier were guarded by the troops of the empire, whose arms would have been more usefully employed to maintain the Roman limits against the Barbarians of Germany and Scythia.

On the side of the Pyrenees, the ambition of Constantine might be justified by the proximity of danger; but his throne was soon established by the conquest, or rather submission, of Spain (A.D. 408); which yielded to the influence of regular and habitual subordination, and received the laws and magistrates of the Gallic præfecture. The only opposition which was made to the authority of Constantine, proceeded not so much from the powers of government, or the spirit of the people, as from the private zeal and interest of the family of Theodosius. Four brothers[2] had obtained, by the favour of their kinsman, the deceased emperor, an honourable rank, and ample possessions, in their native country: and the grateful youths resolved to risk those advantages in the service of his son. After an unsuccessful effort to maintain their ground at the head of the stationary troops of Lusitania, they retired to their estates; where they armed and levied, at their own expence, a considerable body of slaves and dependents, and boldly marched to occupy the strong posts of the Pyrenæan mountains. This domestic insurrection alarmed and perplexed the sovereign of Gaul and Britain; and he was compelled to negociate with some troops of Barbarian auxiliaries, for the service of the Spanish war. They

[1] *Bagaudæ* is the name which Zosimus applies to them; perhaps they deserved a less odious character (Dubos, Hist. Critique, i. 203.). We shall hear of them again.

[2] Verinianus, Didymus, Theodosius, and Lagodius, who, in modern courts, would be styled princes of the blood, were not distinguished by any rank or privileges above the rest of their fellow-subjects.

were distinguished by the title of *Honorians;*[1] a name which might have reminded them of their fidelity to their lawful sovereign; and if it should candidly be allowed that the *Scots* were influenced by any partial affection for a British prince, the *Moors* and the *Marcomanni* could be tempted only by the profuse liberality of the usurper, who distributed among the Barbarians the military, and even the civil, honours of Spain. The nine bands of *Honorians*, which may be easily traced on the establishment of the Western empire, could not exceed the number of five thousand men; yet this inconsiderable force was sufficient to terminate a war, which had threatened the power and safety of Constantine. The rustic army of the Theodosian family was surrounded and destroyed in the Pyrenees: two of the brothers had the good fortune to escape by sea to Italy, or the East; the other two, after an interval of suspense, were executed at Arles; and if Honorius could remain insensible of the public disgrace, he might perhaps be affected by the personal misfortunes of his generous kinsmen. Such were the feeble arms which decided the possession of the Western provinces of Europe, from the wall of Antoninus to the columns of Hercules. The events of peace and war have undoubtedly been diminished by the narrow and imperfect view of the historians of the times, who were equally ignorant of the causes, and of the effects, of the most important revolutions. But the total decay of the national strength had annihilated even the last rescource of a despotic government; and the revenue of exhausted provinces could no longer purchase the military service of a discontented and pusillanimous people.

The poet whose flattery had ascribed to the Roman eagle the victories (A.D. 404—408) of Pollentia and Verona, pursues the hasty retreat of Alaric, from the confines of Italy, with a horrid train of imaginary spectres, such as might hover over an army of Barbarians, which was almost exterminated by war, famine, and disease.[2] In the course of this unfortunate expedition, the king of the Goths must indeed have sustained a considerable loss; and his harrassed forces required an interval of repose to recruit their numbers, and revive their confidence. Adversity had exercised, and displayed, the genius of Alaric; and the fame of his valour invited to the Gothic standard the bravest of the Barbarian warriors; who, from the Euxine to the Rhine, were agitated by the desire of rapine and conquest. He had deserved the esteem, and he soon accepted the friendship, of Stilicho himself. Renouncing the service of the emperor of the East, Alaric concluded, with the court of Ravenna, a treaty of peace and alliance, by which he was declared master-general of the Roman armies throughout the præfecture of Illyricum; as it was claimed, according to the true and ancient limits, by the minister of Honorius.[3] The execution of the ambitious design, which was either stipulated, or implied, in the articles

[1] These *Honoriani*, or *Honoriaci*, consisted of two bands of Scots, or Attacotti, two of Moors, two of Marcomanni, the Victores, the Ascarii, and the Gallicani (Notit. Imper. sect. xxxviii. ed. Lab.). They were part of the 65 *Auxilia Palatina*, and are properly styled, *εν τη αυλη ταξεις*, by Zos. (l. vi. 374.).

[2] ——Comitatur euntem Luctus; et inferni stridentes agmine morbi.
Pallor, et atra fames; et saucia lividus ora Claudian in vi. Cons. Hon. 321, &c.

[3] These dark transactions are investigated by De Buat (Hist. des Peup. de l'Eur. vii. c. iii.—viii. 69.), whose laborious accuracy may sometimes fatigue a superficial reader.

of the treaty, appears to have been suspended by the formidable irruption of Radagaisus; and the neutrality of the Gothic king may perhaps be compared to the indifference of Cæsar, who, in the conspiracy of Catiline, refused either to assist, or to oppose, the enemy of the republic. After the defeat of the Vandals, Stilicho resumed his pretensions to the provinces of the East; appointed civil magistrates for the administration of justice, and of the finances; and declared his impatience to lead to the gates of Constantinople, the united armies of the Romans and of the Goths. The prudence however of Stilicho, his aversion to civil war, and his perfect knowledge of the weakness of the state, may countenance the suspicion, that domestic peace, rather than foreign conquest, was the object of his policy; and that his principal care was to employ the forces of Alaric at a distance from Italy. This design could not long escape the penetration of the Gothic king, who continued to hold a doubtful, and perhaps a treacherous, correspondence with the rival courts; who protracted, like a dissatisfied mercenary, his languid operations in Thessaly and Epirus, and who soon returned to claim the extravagant reward of his ineffectual services. From his camp near Æmona,[1] on the confines of Italy, he transmitted to the emperor of the West, a long account of promises, of expences, and of demands; called for immediate satisfaction, and clearly intimated the consequences of a refusal. Yet if his conduct was hostile, his language was decent and dutiful. He humbly professed himself the friend of Stilicho, and the soldier of Honorius; offered his person and his troops to march, without delay, against the usurper of Gaul; and solicited, as a permanent retreat for the Gothic nation, the possession of some vacant province of the Western empire.

The political and secret transactions of two statesmen, who laboured to deceive each other and the world, must for ever have been concealed in the impenetrable darkness of the cabinet, if the debates (A.D. 408) of a popular assembly had not thrown some rays of light on the correspondence of Alaric and Stilicho. The necessity of finding some artificial support for a government, which, from a principle, not of moderation, but of weakness, was reduced to negotiate with its own subjects, had insensibly revived the authority of the Roman senate: and the minister of Honorius respectfully consulted the legislative council of the republic. Stilicho assembled the senate in the palace of the Cæsars; represented, in a studied oration, the actual state of affairs; proposed the demands of the Gothic king, and submitted to their consideration the choice of peace or war. The senators, as if they had been suddenly awakened from a dream of four hundred years, appeared on this important occasion to be inspired by the courage, rather than by the wisdom, of their predecessors. They loudly declared, in regular speeches, or in tumultuary acclamations, that it was unworthy of the majesty of Rome, to purchase a precarious and disgraceful truce from a Barbarian king; and that, in the judgment of a magnanimous people, the chance of ruin was always preferable to the

[1] Zos. l. v. p. 334. He interrupts his scanty narrative, to relate the fable of Æmona, and of the ship Argo; which was drawn over land from that place to the Adriatic. Soz. (l. viii. c. 25. l. ix. c. 4.) and Socr. (l. vii. c. 10.) cast a pale and doubtful light; and Oros. (l. vii. c. 38, p. 571.) is abominably partial.

certainty of dishonour. The minister, whose pacific intentions were seconded only by the voices of a few servile and venal followers, attempted to allay the general ferment, by an apology for his own conduct and even for the demands of the Gothic prince. "The payment "of a subsidy, which had excited the indignation of the Romans, "ought not (such was the language of Stilicho) to be considered in the "odious light, either of a tribute, or of a ransom, extorted by the "menaces of a Barbarian enemy. Alaric had faithfully asserted the "just pretensions of the republic to the provinces which were usurped "by the Greeks of Constantinople: he modestly required the fair and "stipulated recompence of his services; and if he had desisted from "the prosecution of his enterprise, he had obeyed, in his retreat, the "peremptory, though private, letters of the emperor himself. These "contradictory orders (he would not dissemble the errors of his own "family) had been procured by the intercession of Serena. The "tender piety of his wife had been too deeply affected by the discord "of the royal brothers, the sons of her adopted father; and the senti-"ments of nature had too easily prevailed over the stern dictates of "the public welfare." These ostensible reasons, which faintly disguise the obscure intrigues of the palace of Ravenna, were supported by the authority of Stilicho; and obtained, after a warm debate, the reluctant approbation of the senate. The tumult of virtue and freedom subsided; and the sum of four thousand pounds of gold was granted, under the name of a subsidy, to secure the peace of Italy, and to conciliate the friendship of the king of the Goths. Lampadius alone, one of the most illustrious members of the assembly, still persisted in his dissent; exclaimed with a loud voice, "This is not a treaty of peace, but of "servitude;"[1] and escaped the danger of such bold opposition by immediately retiring to the sanctuary of a Christian church.

But the reign of Stilicho drew towards its end; and the proud minister might perceive the symptons of his approaching disgrace. The generous boldness of Lampadius had been applauded; and the senate, so patiently resigned to a long servitude, rejected with disdain the offer of invidious and imaginary freedom. The troops, who still assumed the name and prerogatives of the Roman legions, were exasperated by the partial affection of Stilicho for the Barbarians: and the people imputed to the mischievous policy of the minister, the public misfortunes, which were the natural consequence of their own degeneracy. Yet Stilicho might have continued to brave the clamours of the people, and even of the soldiers, if he could have maintained his dominion over the feeble mind of his pupil. But the respectful attachment of Honorius was converted (A.D. 408. May) into fear, suspicion, and hatred. The crafty Olympius,[2] who concealed his vices under the mask of

[1] Zos. l. v. 338. He repeats the words of Lampadius, as they were spoke in Latin, "Non est ista pax, sed pactio servitutis," and then translates them into Greek for the benefit of his readers.

[2] He came from the coast of the Euxine, and exercised a splendid office, λαμπρας δε στρατειας εν τοις βασιλειοις αξιουμενος. His actions justify his character, which Zos. l. v. 340.) exposes with visible satisfaction. Augustin revered the piety of Olympius, whom he styles a true son of the church (Baronius, Annal. Eccles. A.D. 408. No. 19, &c. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xiii. 467.). But these praises, which the African saint so unworthily bestows, might proceed, as well from ignorance, as from adulation.

Christian piety, had secretly undermined the benefactor, by whose favour he was promoted to the honourable offices of the Imperial palace. Olympius revealed to the unsuspecting emperor, who had attained the twenty-fifth year of his age, that he was without weight, or authority, in his own government; and artfully alarmed his timid and indolent disposition by a lively picture of the designs of Stilicho, who already meditated the death of his sovereign, with the ambitious hope of placing the diadem on the head of his son Eucherius. The emperor was instigated, by his new favourite, to assume the tone of independent dignity; and the minister was astonished to find, that secret resolutions were formed in the court and council, which were repugnant to his interest, or to his intentions. Instead of residing in the palace of Rome, Honorius declared, that it was his pleasure to return to the secure fortress of Ravenna. On the first intelligence of the death of his brother Arcadius, he prepared to visit Constantinople, and to regulate, with the authority of a guardian, the provinces of the infant Theodosius.[1] The representation of the difficulty and expence of such a distant expedition, checked this strange and sudden sally of active diligence; but the dangerous project of showing the emperor to the camp of Pavia, which was composed of the Roman troops, the enemies of Stilicho, and his Barbarian auxiliaries, remained fixed and unalterable. The minister was pressed, by the advice of his confident Justinian, a Roman advocate, of a lively and penetrating genius, to oppose a journey so prejudicial to his reputation and safety. His strenuous, but ineffectual, efforts confirmed the triumph of Olympius; and the prudent lawyer withdrew himself from the impending ruin of his patron.

In the passage of the emperor through Bologna, a mutiny of the guards was excited and appeased by the secret policy of Stilicho; who announced his instructions to decimate the guilty, and ascribed to his own intercession the merit of their pardon. After this tumult, Honorius embraced, for the last time, the minister whom he now considered as a tyrant, and proceeded on his way to the camp of Pavia; where he was received by the loyal acclamations of the troops who were assembled for the service of the Gallic war. On the morning of the fourth day, he pronounced, as he had been taught, a military oration in the presence of the soldiers, whom the charitable visits, and artful discourses, of Olympius had prepared to execute a dark and bloody conspiracy. At the first signal, they massacred the friends of Stilicho, the most illustrious officers of the empire; two Prætorian præfects, of Gaul, and of Italy; two masters-general, of the cavalry, and infantry; the master of the offices; the quæstor, the treasurer, and the count of the domestics. Many lives were lost; many houses were plundered; the furious sedition continued to rage till the close of the evening; and the trembling emperor, who was seen in the streets of Pavia without his robes or diadem, yielded to the persuasions of his favourite; condemned the memory of the slain; and solemnly approved the innocence and fidelity of their assassins. The intelligence of the massacre of Pavia

[1] Zos. l. v. 338. Soz. l. ix. c. 4. Stilicho offered to undertake the journey to Constantinople, that he might divert Honorius from the vain attempt. The Eastern empire would not have obeyed, and could not have been conquered.

filled the mind of Stilicho with just and gloomy apprehensions: and he instantly summoned, in the camp of Bologna, a council of the confederate leaders, who were attached to his service; and would be involved in his ruin. The impetuous voice of the assembly called aloud for arms, and for revenge; to march, without a moment's delay, under the banners of a hero, whom they had so often followed to victory; to surprise, to oppress, to extirpate the guilty Olympius, and his degenerate Romans; and perhaps to fix the diadem on the head of their injured general. Instead of executing a resolution, which might have been justified by success, Stilicho hesitated till he was irrecoverably lost. He was still ignorant of the fate of the emperor; he distrusted the fidelity of his own party; and he viewed with horror the fatal consequences of arming a crowd of licentious Barbarians, against the soldiers and people of Italy. The confederates, impatient of his timorous and doubtful delay, hastily retired, with fear and indignation. At the hour of midnight, Sarus, a Gothic warrior, renowned among the Barbarians themselves for his strength and valour, suddenly invaded the camp of his benefactor, plundered the baggage, cut in pieces the faithful Huns, who guarded his person, and penetrated to the tent, where the minister, pensive and sleepless, meditated on the dangers of his situation. Stilicho escaped with difficulty from the sword of the Goths; and, after issuing a last and generous admonition to the cities of Italy, to shut their gates against the Barbarians, his confidence, or his despair, urged him to throw himself into Ravenna, which was already in the absolute possession of his enemies. Olympius, who had assumed the dominion of Honorius, was speedily informed, that his rival had embraced, as a suppliant, the altar of the Christian church. The base and cruel disposition of the hypocrite was incapable of pity or remorse; but he piously affected to elude, rather than to violate, the privilege of the sanctuary. Count Heraclian, with a troop of soldiers, appeared, at the dawn of day, before the gates of the church of Ravenna. The bishop was satisfied by a solemn oath, that the Imperial mandate only directed them to secure the person of Stilicho: but, as soon as the unfortunate minister had been tempted beyond the holy threshold, he produced the warrant for his instant execution. Stilicho supported, with calm resignation, the injurious names of traitor and parricide; repressed the unseasonable zeal of his followers, who were ready to attempt an ineffectual rescue; and, with a firmness not unworthy of the last of the Roman generals, submitted his neck to the sword of Heraclian[1] (A.D. 408. Aug. 23).

The servile crowd of the palace, who had so long adored the fortune of Stilicho, affected to insult his fall; and the most distant connexion with the master-general of the West, which had so lately been a title to wealth and honours, was studiously denied, and rigorously punished. His family, united by a triple alliance with the family of Theodosius, might envy the condition of the meanest peasant. The flight of his son Eucherius was intercepted; and the death of that innocent youth soon followed the divorce of Ther-

[1] Zos. (l. v. 336.) has copiously, though not clearly, related the disgrace and death of Stilicho. Olympiod. (apud Phot. p. 177.), Oros. (l. vii. c. 38. p. 571.), Soz. (l. ix. c. 4.), and Philostorg. (l. xi. c. 3. l. xii. c. 2.), afford supplemental hints.

mantia, who filled the place of her sister Maria; and who, like Maria, had remained a virgin in the Imperial bed.[1] The friends of Stilicho, who had escaped the massacre of Pavia, were persecuted by the implacable revenge of Olympius: and the most exquisite cruelty was employed to extort the confession of a treasonable and sacrilegious conspiracy. They died in silence: their firmness justified the choice,[2] and perhaps absolved the innocence of their patron; and the despotic power, which could take his life without a trial, and stigmatize his memory without a proof, has no jurisdiction over the impartial suffrage of posterity.[3] The services of Stilicho are great and manifest; his crimes, as they are vaguely stated in the language of flattery and hatred, are obscure, at least, and improbable. About four months after his death, an edict was published, in the name of Honorius, to restore the free communication of the two empires, which had been so long interrupted by the *public enemy*.[4] The minister, whose fame and fortune depended on the prosperity of the state, was accused of betraying Italy to the Barbarians; whom he repeatedly vanquished at Pollentia, at Verona, and before the walls of Florence. His pretended design of placing the diadem on the head of his son Eucherius, could not have been conducted without preparations or accomplices; and the ambitious father would not surely have left the future emperor, till the twentieth year of his age, in the humble station of tribune of the notaries. Even the religion of Stilicho was arraigned by the malice of his rival. The seasonable, and almost miraculous, deliverance was devoutly celebrated by the applause of the clergy; who asserted, that the restoration of idols, and the persecution of the church, would have been the first measure of the reign of Eucherius. The son of Stilicho, however, was educated in the bosom of Christianity, which his father had uniformly professed, and zealously supported.[5] Serena had borrowed her magnificent necklace from the statue of Vesta;[6] and the Pagans execrated the memory of the sacrilegious minister, by whose order the Sibylline books, the oracles of Rome, had been committed to the flames.[7] The pride and power of Stilicho constituted his real guilt. An honourable reluctance to shed the blood of his countrymen, appears to have contributed to the

[1] Zos. l. v. 333. The marriage of a Christian with two sisters, scandalizes Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 557.); who expects, in vain, that pope Innocent I. should have done something in the way, either of censure, or of dispensation.

[2] Two of his friends are honourably mentioned (Zos. l. v. 346.); Peter, chief of the school of notaries, and the great chamberlain Deuterius. Stilicho had secured the bed-chamber; and it is surprising, that, under a feeble prince, the bed-chamber was not able to secure him.

[3] Oros. (l. vii. c. 38. p. 571.) seems to copy the false and furious manifestos, which were dispersed through the provinces by the new administration.

[4] Theod. Code, l. vii. tit. xvi. leg. 1. l. ix. tit. xlii. leg. 22. Stilicho is branded with the name of *prædo publicus,* who employed his wealth, *ad omnem ditandam, inquietandamque Barbariem.*

[5] Augustin himself is satisfied with the effectual laws, which Stilicho had enacted against heretics and idolaters; and which are still extant in the Code. He only applies to Olympius for their confirmation (Baronius, Annal. Eccles. A.D. 408. No. 19.).

[6] Zos. l. v. 351. We may observe the bad taste of the age, in dressing their statues with such awkward finery.

[7] Rutilius Numatianus (Itinerar. l. ii. 41.), to whom religious enthusiasm has dictated some elegant and forcible lines. Stilicho likewise stripped the gold plates from the doors of the Capitol, and read a prophetic sentence, which was engraven under them (Zos. l. v. 352.). These are foolish stories; yet the charge of *impiety* adds weight and credit to the praise, which Zosimus reluctantly bestows, of his virtues.

success of his unworthy rival; and it is the last humiliation of the character of Honorius, that posterity has not condescended to reproach him with his base ingratitude to the guardian of his youth, and the support of his empire.

Among the train of dependents, whose wealth and dignity attracted the notice of their own times, *our* curiosity is excited by the celebrated name of the poet Claudian, who enjoyed the favour of Stilicho, and was overwhelmed in the ruin of his patron. The titular offices of tribune and notary fixed his rank in the Imperial court: he was indebted to the powerful intercession of Serena for his marriage with a very rich heiress of the province of Africa;[1] and the statue of Claudian, erected in the forum of Trajan, was a monument of the taste and liberality of the Roman senate.[2] After the praises of Stilicho became offensive and criminal, Claudian was exposed to the enmity of a powerful and unforgiving courtier, whom he had provoked by the insolence of wit. He had compared, in a lively epigram, the opposite characters of two Prætorian præfects of Italy; he contrasts the innocent repose of a philosopher, who sometimes resigned the hours of business to slumber, perhaps to study; with the interested diligence of a rapacious minister, indefatigable in the pursuit of unjust or sacrilegious gain. "How happy," continues Claudian, "how happy "might it be for the people of Italy, if Mallius could be constantly "awake, and if Hadrian would always sleep!"[3] The repose of Mallius was not disturbed by this friendly and gentle admonition; but the cruel vigilance of Hadrian watched the opportunity of revenge, and easily obtained, from the enemies of Stilicho, the trifling sacrifice of an obnoxious poet. The poet concealed himself, however, during the tumult of the revolution; and, consulting the dictates of prudence rather than of honour, he addressed, in the form of an epistle, a suppliant and humble recantation to the offended præfect. He deplores, in mournful strains, the fatal indiscretion into which he had been hurried by passion and folly; submits to the imitation of his adversary, the generous examples of the clemency of gods, of heroes, and of lions; and expresses his hope, that the magnanimity of Hadrian will not trample on a defenceless and contemptible foe, already humbled by disgrace and poverty; and deeply wounded by the exile, the tortures, and the death of his dearest friends.[4] Whatever might

[1] At the nuptials of Orpheus (a modest comparison!) all the parts of animated nature contributed their various gifts; and the gods themselves enriched their favourite. Claudian had neither flocks, nor herds, nor vines, nor olives. His wealthy bride was heiress to them all. But he carried to Africa a recommendatory letter from Serena, his Juno, and was made happy (Epist. ii. ad Serenam).

[2] Claudian feels the honour like a man who deserved it (in præfat. Bell. Get.). The original inscription, on marble, was found at Rome, in the fifteenth century, in the house of Pomponius Lætus. The statue of a poet, far superior to Claudian, should have been erected during his life-time, by the men of letters, his countrymen and contemporaries. It was a noble design!

[3] Epigram xxx.

Mallius indulget somno noctesque diesque:
Insomnis *Pharius* sacra, profana, rapit.
Omnibus, hoc, Italæ gentes, exposcite votis
Mallius ut vigilet, dormiat ut Pharius.

Hadrian was a Pharian (of Alexandria). See his public life in Godefroy, Cod. Theodos. vi. 364. Mallius did not always sleep. He composed some elegant dialogues on the Greek systems of natural philosophy (Claud. in Mall. Theodor. Cons. 61—112.).

[4] Claudian's first Epistle. Yet, in some places, an air of irony and indignation betrays his secret reluctance.

be the success of his prayer, or the accidents of his future life, the period of a few years levelled in the grave the minister and the poet: but the name of Hadrian is almost sunk in oblivion, while Claudian is read with pleasure in every country which has retained, or acquired, the knowledge of the Latin language. If we fairly balance his merits and his defects, we shall acknowledge, that Claudian does not either satisfy, or silence, our reason. It would not be easy to produce a passage that deserves the epithet of sublime or pathetic; to select a verse, that melts the heart, or enlarges the imagination. We should vainly seek, in the poems of Claudian, the happy invention and artificial conduct, of an interesting fable; or the just and lively representation of the characters and situations of real life. For the service of his patron, he published occasional panegyrics and invectives: and the design of these slavish compositions encouraged his propensity to exceed the limits of truth and nature. These imperfections, however, are compensated in some degree by the poetical virtues of Claudian. He was endowed with the rare and precious talent of raising the meanest, of adorning the most barren, and of diversifying the most similar, topics: his colouring, more especially in descriptive poetry, is soft and splendid; and he seldom fails to display, and even to abuse, the advantages of a cultivated understanding, a copious fancy, an easy, and sometimes forcible, expression; and a perpetual flow of harmonious versification. To these commendations, independent of any accidents of time and place, we must add the peculiar merit which Claudian derived from the unfavourable circumstances of his birth. In the decline of arts, and of empire, a native of Egypt,[1] who had received the education of a Greek, assumed, in a mature age, the familiar use, and absolute command, of the Latin language;[2] soared above the heads of his feeble contemporaries; and placed himself, after an interval of three hundred years, among the poets of ancient Rome.[3]

[1] National vanity has made him a Florentine, or a Spaniard. But the first epistle of Claudian proves him a native of Alexandria (Fabric. Bibliot. Latin. iii. 191. ed. Ernest.).

[2] His first Latin verses were composed during the consulship of Probinus, A.D. 395.

Romanos bibimus primum, te consule, fontes, Et Latiæ cessit Graia Thalia togæ.

Besides some Greek Epigrams which are still extant, the Latin poet had composed in Greek, the Antiquities of Tarsus, Anazarbus, Berytus, Nice, &c. It is more easy to supply the loss of good poetry, than of authentic history.

[3] Strada (Prolusion v, vi.) allows him to contend with the five heroic poets, Lucretius, Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, and Statius. His patron is the accomplished courtier Balthazar Castiglione. His admirers are numerous and passionate. Yet the rigid critics reproach exotic weeds, or flowers, which spring too luxuriantly in his Latian soil.

CHAPTER XXXI.

Invasion of Italy by Alaric.—Manners of the Roman Senate and People.—Rome is thrice besieged, and at length pillaged, by the Goths.—Death of Alaric.—The Goths evacuate Italy.—Fall of Constantine.—Gaul and Spain are occupied by the Barbarians.—Independence of Britain.

THE incapacity of a weak and distracted government may often assume the appearance, and produce the effects, of a treasonable correspondence with the public enemy. If Alaric himself had been introduced (A.D. 408. Sept.) into the council of Ravenna, he would probably have advised the same measures which were actually pursued by the ministers of Honorius.[1] The king of the Goths would have conspired, perhaps with some reluctance, to destroy the formidable adversary, by whose arms, in Italy as well as in Greece, he had been twice overthrown. *Their* active and interested hatred laboriously accomplished the disgrace and ruin of the great Stilicho. The valour of Sarus, his fame in arms, and his personal, or hereditary, influence over the confederate Barbarians, could recommend him only to the friends of their country, who despised, or detested, the worthless characters of Turpilio, Varanes, and Vigilantius. By the pressing instances of the new favourites, these generals, unworthy as they had shown themselves of the name of soldiers,[2] were promoted to the command of the cavalry, of the infantry, and of the domestic troops. The Gothic prince would have subscribed with pleasure the edict which the fanaticism of Olympius dictated to the simple and devout emperor. Honorius excluded all persons, who were adverse to the Catholic church, from holding any office in the state; obstinately rejected the service of all those who dissented from his religion; and rashly disqualified many of his bravest and most skilful officers, who adhered to the Pagan worship, or who had imbibed the opinions of Arianism.[3] These measures, so advantageous to an enemy, Alaric would have approved, and might perhaps have suggested; but it may seem doubtful, whether the Barbarian would have promoted his interest at the expence of the inhuman and absurd cruelty, which was perpetrated by the direction, or at least with the connivance, of the Imperial ministers. The foreign auxiliaries, who had been attached to the person of Stilicho, lamented his death; but the desire of revenge was checked by a natural apprehension for the safety of their wives and children; who were detained as hostages in the strong cities of Italy, where they had likewise deposited their most valuable

[1] The series of events, from the death of Stilicho, to the arrival of Alaric before Rome, can only be found in Zos. l. v. 347.

[2] The expression of Zosimus is strong and lively, *καταφρονησιν εμποιησαι τοις πολεμιοις αρκοντας*, sufficient to excite the contempt of the enemy.

[3] Eos qui catholicæ sectæ sunt inimici, intra palatium militare prohibemus. Nullus nobis sit aliquâ ratione conjunctus, qui a nobis fide et religione discordat. Cod. Theod. l. xvi. tit. v. leg. 42. and Godefroy, vi. 164. This law was applied in the utmost latitude, and rigorously executed. Zos. l. v. 364.

effects. At the same hour, and as if by a common signal, the cities of Italy were polluted by the same horrid scenes of universal massacre and pillage, which involved, in promiscuous destruction, the families and fortunes of the Barbarians. Exasperated by such an injury, which might have awakened the tamest and most servile spirit, they cast a look of indignation and hope towards the camp of Alaric, and unanimously swore to pursue, with just and implacable war, the perfidious nation, that had so basely violated the laws of hospitality. By the imprudent conduct of the ministers of Honorius, the republic lost the assistance, and deserved the enmity, of 30,000 of her bravest soldiers: and the weight of that formidable army, which alone might have determined the event of the war, was transferred from the scale of the Romans into that of the Goths.

In the arts of negociation, as well as in those of war, the Gothic king maintained (A.D. 408. Oct.) his superior ascendant over an enemy, whose seeming changes proceeded from the total want of counsel and design. From his camp, on the confines of Italy, Alaric attentively observed the revolutions of the palace, watched the progress of faction and discontent, disguised the hostile aspect of a Barbarian invader, and assumed the more popular appearance of the friend and ally of the great Stilicho; to whose virtues, when they were no longer formidable, he could pay a just tribute of sincere praise and regret. The pressing invitation of the malcontents, who urged the king of the Goths to invade Italy, was enforced by a lively sense of his personal injuries; and he might speciously complain that the Imperial ministers still delayed and eluded the payment of the 4000 pounds of gold; which had been granted by the Roman senate, either to reward his services, or to appease his fury. His decent firmness was supported by an artful moderation, which contributed to the success of his designs. He required a fair and reasonable satisfaction; but he gave the strongest assurances, that, as soon as he had obtained it, he would immediately retire. He refused to trust the faith of the Romans, unless Ætius and Jason, the sons of two great officers of state, were sent as hostages to his camp: but he offered to deliver, in exchange, several of the noblest youths of the Gothic nation. The modesty of Alaric was interpreted, by the ministers of Ravenna, as a sure evidence of his weakness and fear. They disdained either to negociate a treaty, or to assemble an army; and with a rash confidence, derived only from their ignorance of the extreme danger, irretrievably wasted the decisive moments of peace and war. While they expected, in sullen silence, that the Barbarians should evacuate the confines of Italy, Alaric, with bold and rapid marches, passed the Alps and the Po; hastily pillaged the cities of Aquileia, Altinum, Concordia, and Cremona, which yielded to his arms; increased his forces by the accession of 30,000 auxiliaries; and, without meeting a single enemy in the field, advanced as far as the edge of the morass which protected the impregnable residence of the emperor of the West. Instead of attempting the hopeless siege of Ravenna, the prudent leader of the Goths proceeded to Rimini, stretched his ravages along the sea-coast of the Hadriatic, and meditated the conquest of the ancient mistress of the world. An Italian hermit, whose

zeal and sanctity were respected by the Barbarians themselves, encountered the victorious monarch, and boldly denounced the indignation of Heaven against the oppressors of the earth: but the saint himself was confounded by the solemn asseveration of Alaric, that he felt a secret and prætematural impulse, which directed, and even compelled, his march to the gates of Rome. He felt, that his genius and his fortune were equal to the most arduous enterprises; and the enthusiasm which he communicated to the Goths, insensibly removed the popular, and almost superstitious, reverence of the nations for the majesty of the Roman name. His troops, animated by the hopes of spoil, followed the course of the Flaminian way, occupied the unguarded passes of the Apennine,[1] descended into the rich plains of Umbria; and, as they lay encamped on the banks of the Clitumnus, might wantonly slaughter and devour the milk-white oxen, which had been so long reserved for the use of Roman triumphs.[2] A lofty situation, and a seasonable tempest of thunder and lightning, preserved the little city of Narni; but the king of the Goths, despising the ignoble prey, still advanced with unabated vigour; and after he had passed through the stately arches, adorned with the spoils of Barbaric victories, he pitched his camp under the walls of Rome.[3]

During a period of six hundred and nineteen years, the seat of empire had never been violated by the presence of a foreign enemy. The unsuccessful expedition of Hannibal,[4] served only to display the character of the senate and people; of a senate degraded, rather than ennobled, by the comparison of an assembly of kings; and of a people to whom the ambassador of Pyrrhus ascribed the inexhaustible resources of the Hydra.[5] Each of the senators, in the time of the Punic war, had accomplished his term of military service, either in a subordinate or a superior station; and the decree, which invested with contemporary command all those who had been consuls, or censors, or dictators, gave the republic the immediate assistance of many brave and experienced generals. In the beginning of the war, the Roman people consisted of 250,000 citizens of an age to bear arms.[6] Fifty

[1] Addison (Works, vol. ii. 54.) has given a very picturesque description of the road through the Apennine. The Goths were not at leisure to observe the beauties of the prospect; but they were pleased to find that the Saxa Intercisa, a narrow passage which Vespasian had cut through the rock (Cluver. Italia Antiq. i. 618.) was totally neglected.

[2] Hinc albi Clitumni greges, et maxima Taurus
Victima; sæpe tuo perfusi flumine sacro
Romanos ad templa Deum duxere Triumphos.

Besides Virgil, most of the Latin poets, Propertius, Lucan, Silius Italicus, Claudian, &c. whose passages may be found in Cluverius and Addison, have celebrated the triumphal victims of the Clitumnus.

[3] Some ideas of the march of Alaric are borrowed from the journey of Honorius over the same ground. (Claud. in vi. Cons. Hon. 494.) The measured distance between Ravenna and Rome, was 254 Roman miles. Itin. Wess. p. 126.

[4] The march and retreat of Hannibal are described by Livy, l. xxvi. c. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.; and the reader is made a spectator of the interesting scene.

[5] These comparisons were used by Cyneas, the counsellor of Pyrrhus, after his return from his embassy, in which he had diligently studied the discipline and manners of Rome. Plutarch in Pyrrho, ii. 459.

[6] In the three *census* which were made of the Roman people, about the time of the second Punic war, the numbers stand as follows (see Livy, Epitom. l. xx. Hist. l. xxvii. 36. xxix. 37.), 270, 213, 137, 108, 214,000. The fall of the second, and the rise of the third, appears so enormous, that several critics, notwithstanding the unanimity of the MSS. have suspected some corruption of the text of Livy. (Drakenborch ad xxvii. 36. and Beaufort, Repub. Romaine,

thousand had already died in the defence of their country; and the twenty-three legions which were employed in the different camps of Italy, Greece, Sardinia, Sicily, and Spain, required about 100,000 men. But there still remained an equal number in Rome, and the adjacent territory, who were animated by the same intrepid courage; and every citizen was trained from his earliest youth, in the discipline and exercises of a soldier. Hannibal was astonished by the constancy of the senate, who, without raising the siege of Capua, or recalling their scattered forces, expected his approach. He encamped on the banks of the Anio, at the distance of three miles from the city: and he was soon informed, that the ground on which he had pitched his tent was sold for an adequate price at a public auction; and that a body of troops was dismissed by an opposite road, to reinforce the legions of Spain.[1] He led his Africans to the gates of Rome, where he found three armies in order of battle, prepared to receive him; but Hannibal dreaded the event of a combat, from which he could not hope to escape, unless he destroyed the last of his enemies; and his speedy retreat confessed the invincible courage of the Romans.

From the time of the Punic war, the uninterrupted succession of senators had preserved the name and image of the republic; and the degenerate subjects of Honorius ambitiously derived their descent from the heroes who had repulsed the arms of Hannibal, and subdued the nations of the earth. The temporal honours, which the devout Paula[2] inherited and despised, are carefully recapitulated by Jerom, the guide of her conscience, and the historian of her life. The genealogy of her father, Rogatus, which ascended as high as Agamemnon, might seem to betray a Grecian origin; but her mother, Blæsilla, numbered the Scipios, Æmilius Paulus, and the Gracchi, in the list of her ancestors; and Toxotius, the husband of Paula, deduced his royal lineage from Æneas, the father of the Julian line. The vanity of the rich, who desired to be noble, was gratified by these lofty pretensions. Encouraged by the applause of their parasites, they easily imposed on the credulity of the vulgar; and were countenanced, in some measure, by the custom of adopting the name of their patron, which had always prevailed among the freedmen and clients of illustrious families. Most of those families, however, attacked by so many causes of external violence or internal decay, were gradually extirpated: and it would be more reasonable to seek for a lineal descent of twenty generations, among the mountains of the Alps, or in the peaceful solitude of Apulia, than on the theatre of Rome, the seat of fortune, of danger, and of perpetual revolutions. Under each successive reign,

i. 325.) They did not consider that the second *census* was taken only at Rome, and that the numbers were diminished, not only by the death, but likewise by the *absence*, of many soldiers. In the third *census*, Livy expressly affirms, that the legions were mustered by the care of particular commissaries. From the numbers on the list, we must always deduct one twelfth above threescore, and incapable of bearing arms. Popul. de la France, p. 72.

[1] Livy considers these two incidents as the effects only of chance and courage. I suspect that they were both managed by the admirable policy of the senate.

[2] Jerom. i. 169. ad Eustochium; he bestows on Paula the splendid titles of Gracchorum stirps, soboles Scipionum, Pauli hæres, cujus vocabulum trahit, Martiæ Papyriæ Matris Africani vera et germana propago. This particular description supposes a more solid title than the surname of Julius, which Toxotius shared with a thousand families of the Western provinces. See the index of Tacitus, of Gruter's Inscrip. &c.

and from every province of the empire, a crowd of hardy adventurers, rising to eminence by their talents or their vices, usurped the wealth, the honours, and the palaces of Rome; and oppressed, or protected, the poor and humble remains of consular families; who were ignorant, perhaps, of the glory of their ancestors.[1]

In the time of Jerom and Claudian, the senators unanimously yielded the pre-eminence to the Anician line; and a slight view of *their* history will serve to appreciate the rank and antiquity of the noble families, which contended only for the second place.[2] During the five first ages of the city, the name of the Anicians was unknown; they appear to have derived their origin from Præneste; and the ambition of those new citizens was long satisfied with the Plebeian honours of tribunes of the people.[3] One hundred and sixty-eight years before the Christian æra, the family was ennobled by the prætorship of Anicius, who gloriously terminated the Illyrian war by the conquest of the nation, and the captivity of their king.[4] From the triumph of that general, three consulships, in distant periods, mark the succession of the Anician name.[5] From the reign of Diocletian to the final extinction of the Western empire, that name shone with a lustre which was not eclipsed in the public estimation, by the majesty of the imperial purple.[6] The several branches, to whom it was communicated, united, by marriage or inheritance, the wealth and titles of the Annian, the Petronian, and the Olybrian houses; and in each generation the number of consulships was multiplied by an hereditary claim.[7] The Anician family excelled in faith and in riches: they were the first of the Roman senate who embraced Christianity; and it is probable that Anicius

[1] Tacitus (Annal. iii. 55.) affirms, that between the battle of Actium and the reign of Vespasian, the senate was gradually filled with new families from the Municipia and colonies of Italy.

[2] Nec quisquam Procerum tentet (licet ære vetusto
Floreat, et claro cingatur Roma senatû)
Se jactare parem; sed primâ sede relictâ
Aucheniis, de jure licet certare secundo.
Claud. in Prob. et Olybrii Coss. 18.

Such a compliment paid to the obscure name of the Auchenii has amazed the critics; but they all agree, that whatever may be the true reading, the sense of Claudian can be applied only to the Anician family.

[3] The earliest date in the annals of Pighius, is that of M. Anicius Gallus. Trib. Pl. A.U.C. 506. Another Tribune, Q. Anicius, A.U.C. 508. is distinguished by the epithet of Prænestinus. Livy (xlv. 43.) places the Anicii below the great families of Rome.

[4] Livy, xliv. 30. xlv. 3. 26. 43. He fairly appreciates the merit of Anicius, and justly observes, that his fame was clouded by the superior lustre of the Macedonian, which preceded the Illyrian, triumph.

[5] The dates of the three consulships are, A.U.C. 593, 818, 967: the two last under the reigns of Nero and Caracalla. The second of these consuls distinguished himself only by his infamous flattery (Tacit. Annal. xv. 74.): but even the evidence of crimes, if they bear the stamp of greatness and antiquity, is admitted, without reluctance, to prove the genealogy of a noble house.

[6] In the sixth century, the nobility of the Anician name is mentioned (Cassiodor. Varior. l. x. Ep. 10. 12.) with singular respect by the minister of a Gothic king of Italy.

[7] ———— Fixus in omnes
Cognatos procedit honos; quemcumque requiras
Hâc de stirpe virum, certum est de Consule nasci.
Per fasces numerantur Avi, semperque renatâ
Nobilitate virent, et prolem fata sequuntur.

(Claud. in Prob. et Olyb. Consulat. 12, &c.). The Annii, whose name seems to have merged in the Anician, mark the Fasti with many consulships, from the time of Vespasian to the fourth century.

Julian, who was afterwards consul and præfect of the city, atoned for his attachment to the party of Maxentius, by the readiness with which he accepted the religion of Constantine.[1] Their ample patrimony was increased by the industry of Probus, the chief of the Anician family; who shared with Gratian the honours of the consulship, and exercised, four times, the high office of Prætorian præfect.[2] His immense estates were scattered over the wide extent of the Roman world ; and though the public might suspect, or disapprove, the methods, by which they had been acquired; the generosity and magnificence of that fortunate statesman deserved the gratitude of his clients, and the admiration of strangers.[3] Such was the respect entertained for his memory, that the two sons of Probus, in their earliest youth, and at the request of the senate, were associated in the consular dignity: a memorable distinction, without example, in the annals of Rome.—*Poem addressed by Claudian to the two noble youths.*

"The marbles of the Anician palace," were used as a proverbial expression of opulence and splendour;[4] but the nobles and senators of Rome aspired, in due gradation, to imitate that illustrious family. The accurate description of the city, which was composed in the Theodosian age, enumerates 1780 *houses*, the residence of wealthy and honourable citizens.—*Nardini, Roma Antica*, p. 89. 498. Many of these stately mansions might almost excuse the exaggeration of the poet; that Rome contained a multitude of palaces, and that each palace was equal to a city: since it included within its own precincts everything which could be subservient either to use or luxury; markets, hippodromes, temples, fountains, baths, porticos, shady groves, and artificial aviaries.[5] The historian Olympiodorus, who represents the state of Rome when it was besieged by the Goths,[6] continues to observe, that several of the richest senators received from their estates an annual income of 4000 pounds of gold, above £160,000, without computing the stated provision of corn and wine, which, had they been sold, might have equalled in value one third of the money. Compared to this immoderate wealth, an ordinary revenue of 1000 or 1500 pounds of gold might be considered as no more than adequate to the dignity of the senatorian rank, which required many expences of a

[1] The title of first Christian senator may be justified by the authority of Prudentius (in Symmach. i. 553.), and the dislike of the Pagans to the Anician family. Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. iv. 183. v. 44. Baron. Annal. A.D. 312. No. 78. A.D. 322. No. 2.

[2] Probus . . . claritudine generis et potentiâ et opûm magnitudine, cognitus Orbi Romano, per quem universum pœne patrimonia sparsa possedit, juste an secus non judicioli est nostri. Ammian. Marcellin. xxvii. 11. His children and widow erected for him a magnificent tomb in the Vatican, which was demolished in the time of pope Nicholas V. to make room for the new church of St. Peter. Baronius, who laments the ruin of this Christian monument, has diligently preserved the inscriptions and basso-relievos. Annal. Eccles. A.D. 395. No. 5—17.

[3] Two Persian Satraps travelled to Milan and Rome, to hear St. Ambrose, and to see Probus. (Paulin. in Vit. Ambros.) Claud. (in Cons. Probin. et Olybr. 30—60.) seems at a loss how to express the glory of Probus.

[4] Secundinus, the Manichæan, ap. Baron. Annal. Eccles. A.D. 390. No. 34.

[5] Quid loquar inclusas inter laquearia sylvas; Vernula quæ vario carmine ludit avis.
Claud. Rutil. Numatian Itiner. ver. 111.
The poet lived at the time of the Gothic invasion. A moderate palace would have covered Cincinnatus's farm of four acres (Val. Max. iv. 4.). In laxitatem ruris excurrunt, says Seneca, Epist. 114. Mr. Hume's Essays, i. 562.

[6] This curious account of Rome, in the reign of Honorius, is found in a fragment of the historian Olympiodorus, ap. Photium, p. 197.

public and ostentatious kind. Several examples are recorded in the age of Honorius, of vain and popular nobles who celebrated the year of their prætorship, by a festival which lasted seven days, and cost above £100,000.[1] The estates of the Roman senators, which so far exceeded the proportion of modern wealth, were not confined to the limits of Italy. Their possessions extended far beyond the Ionian and Ægean seas, to the most distant provinces; the city of Nicopolis, which Augustus had founded as an eternal monument of the Actian victory, was the property of the devout Paula;[2] and it is observed by Seneca, that the rivers which had divided hostile nations, now flowed through the lands of private citizens.[3] According to their temper and circumstances, the estates of the Romans were either cultivated by the labour of their slaves, or granted, for a certain and stipulated rent, to the industrious farmer. The economical writers of antiquity strenuously recommend the former method, wherever it may be practicable; but if the object should be removed, by its distance or magnitude, from the immediate eye of the master, they prefer the active care of an old hereditary tenant, attached to the soil, and interested in the produce, to the mercenary administration of a negligent, perhaps an unfaithful, steward.[4]

The opulent nobles of an immense capital, who were never excited by the pursuit of military glory, and seldom engaged in the occupations of civil government, naturally resigned their leisure to the business and amusements of private life. At Rome, commerce was always held in contempt: but the senators, from the first age of the republic, increased their patrimony, and multiplied their clients, by the lucrative practice of usury; and the obsolete laws were eluded, or violated, by the mutual inclinations and interest of both parties.[5] A considerable mass of treasure must always have existed at Rome, either in the current coin of the empire, or in the form of gold and silver plate;

[1] The sons of Alpius, of Symmachus, and of Maximus, spent, during their respective prætorships, 12, or 20, or 40, *centenaries* (or, hundred weight of gold). Olympiodor. ap. Phot. p. 197. This popular estimation allows some latitude; but it is difficult to explain a law in the Theod. Code (l. vi. leg. 5.), which fixes the expence of the first prætor at 25,000, of the second at 20,000, and of the third at 15,000 *folles*. The name of *follis* (Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. xxviii. 727.) was equally applied to a purse of 125 pieces of silver, and to a small copper coin of the value of $\frac{1}{2625}$ part of that purse. In the former sense, the 25,000 folles would be equal to £150,000, in the latter to five or six pounds sterling. The one appears extravagant, the other is ridiculous. There must have existed some third and middle value, which is here understood; but ambiguity is an inexcusable fault in the language of laws.

[2] Nicopolis . . . in Actiaco littore sita possessionis vestræ nunc pars vel maxima est. Jerom. in præfat. Comment. ad Epistol. ad Titum, tom. ix. 243. Tillemont supposes, strangely enough, that it was part of Agamemnon's inheritance. Mem. Eccles. xii. 85.

[3] Seneca, Epist. lxxxix. His language is of the declamatory kind: but declamation could scarcely exaggerate the avarice and luxury of the Romans. The philosopher himself deserved some share of the reproach; if it be true, that his rigorous exaction of *Quadringenties*, above £300,000, which he had lent at high interest, provoked a rebellion in Britain. (Dion Cassius l. lxii. 1003.) According to the conjecture of Gale (Antoninus's Itiner. in Britain, p. 92.), the same Faustinus possessed an estate near Bury, in Suffolk, and another in the kingdom of Naples.

[4] Volusius, a wealthy senator (Tacit. Annal. iii. 30.), always preferred tenants born on the estate. Columella, who received this maxim from him, argues very judiciously on the subject. De Re Rusticâ, l. i. c. 7. 408. ed. Leipsig, 1735.

[5] Valesius (ad Ammian. xiv. 6.) has proved, from Chrysostom and Augustin, that the senators were not allowed to lend money at usury. Yet it appears from the Theod. Code (Godefroy ad l. ii. tit. xxxiii. i. 230.), that they were permitted to take six per cent. or one half of the legal interest; and, what is more singular, this permission was granted to the *young* senators.

and there were many sideboards in the time of Pliny, which contained more solid silver than had been transported by Scipio from vanquished Carthage.[1] The greater part of the nobles, who dissipated their fortunes in profuse luxury, found themselves poor in the midst of wealth; and idle in a constant round of dissipation. Their desires were continually gratified by the labour of a thousand hands; of the numerous train of their domestic slaves, who were actuated by the fear of punishment; and of the various professions of artificers and merchants, who were more powerfully impelled by the hopes of gain. The ancients were destitute of many of the conveniencies of life, which have been invented or improved by the progress of industry; and the plenty of glass and linen has diffused more real comforts among the modern nations of Europe, than the senators of Rome could derive from all the refinements of pompous or sensual luxury.[2] Their luxury, and their manners, have been the subject of minute and laborious disquisition: but as such enquiries would divert me too long from the design of the present work, I shall produce an authentic state of Rome and its inhabitants, which is more peculiarly applicable to the period of the Gothic invasion. Ammianus Marcellinus, who prudently chose the capital of the empire, as the residence the best adapted to the historian of his own times, has mixed with the narrative of public events, a lively representation of the scenes with which he was familiarly conversant. The judicious reader will not always approve the asperity of censure, the choice of circumstances, or the style of expression: he will perhaps detect the latent prejudices, and personal resentments, which soured the temper of Ammianus himself; but he will surely observe, with philosophic curiosity, the interesting and original picture of the manners of Rome.[3]

"The greatness of Rome (such is the language of the historian) was "founded on the rare, and almost incredible, alliance of virtue and of "fortune. The long period of her infancy was employed in a laborious "struggle against the tribes of Italy, the neighbours and enemies of "the rising city. In the strength and ardour of youth, she sustained "the storms of war; carried her victorious arms beyond the seas and "the mountains; and brought home triumphant laurels from every "country of the globe. At length, verging towards old age, and some-"times conquering by the terror only of her name, she sought the "blessings of ease and tranquillity. The VENERABLE CITY, which "had trampled on the necks of the fiercest nations; and established "a system of laws, the perpetual guardians of justice and freedom; "was content, like a wise and wealthy parent, to devolve on the Cæsars,

[1] Plin. Hist. Natur. xxxiii. 50. He states the silver at only 4380 pounds, which is increased by Livy (xxx. 45.) to 100,023: the former seems too little for an opulent city, the latter too much for any private side-board.

[2] The learned Arbuthnot (Tables of Ancient Coins, p. 153.) has observed with humour, and I believe with truth, that Augustus had neither glass to his windows, nor a shirt to his back. Under the lower empire, the use of linen and glass became somewhat more common.

[3] It is incumbent on me to explain the liberties which I have taken with the text of Ammianus. 1. I have melted down into one piece, the sixth chapter of the fourteenth, and the fourth of the twenty-eighth book. 2. I have given order and connexion to the confused mass of materials. 3. I have softened *some* extravagant hyperboles, and pared away some superfluities of the original. 4. I have developed some observations, which were insinuated, rather than expressed. With these allowances, my version will be found, not literal indeed, but faithful and exact.

"her favourite sons, the care of governing her ample patrimony.[1] A "secure and profound peace, such as had been once enjoyed in the "reign of Numa, succeeded to the tumults of a republic: while Rome "was still adored as the queen of the earth; and the subject nations "still reverenced the name of the people, and the majesty of the senate. "But this native splendour is degraded, and sullied, by the conduct of "some nobles; who, unmindful of their own dignity, and of that of "their country, assume an unbounded licence of vice and folly. They "contend with each other in the empty vanity of titles and surnames; "and curiously select, or invent, the most lofty and sonorous appella- "tions, Reburrus, or Fabunius, Pagonius, or Tarrasius,[2] which may "impress the ears of the vulgar with astonishment and respect. From "a vain ambition of perpetuating their memory, they affect to multiply "their likeness, in statues of bronze and marble; nor are they satis- "fied, unless those statues are covered with plates of gold: an hon- "ourable distinction, first granted to Acilius the consul, after he had "subdued, by his arms and counsels, the power of king Antiochus. "The ostentation of displaying, of magnifying perhaps, the rent-roll "of the estates which they possess in all the provinces, from the rising "to the setting sun, provokes the just resentment of every man, who "recollects, that their poor and invincible ancestors were not dis- "tinguished from the meanest of the soldiers, by the delicacy of their "food, or the splendour of their apparel. But the modern nobles "measure their rank and consequence according to the loftiness of "their chariots,[3] and the weighty magnificence of their dress. Their "long robes of silk and purple float in the wind; and as they are "agitated, by art or accident, they occasionally discover the under "garments, the rich tunics, embroidered with the figures of various "animals.[4] Followed by a train of fifty servants, and tearing up the "pavement, they move along the streets with the same impetuous "speed as if they travelled with post-horses; and the example of the "senators is boldly imitated by the matrons and ladies, whose covered

[1] Claudian, who seems to have read the history of Ammianus, speaks of this great revolution in a much less courtly style:

> Postquam jura ferox in se communia Cæsar
> Transtulit; et lapsi mores; desuetaque priscis
> Artibus, in gremium pacis servile recessi.
>
> De Bell. Gildonico, 49.

[2] The minute diligence of antiquarians has not been able to verify these extraordinary names. I am of opinion that they were invented by the historian himself, who was afraid of any personal satire or application. It is certain, however, that the simple denominations of the Romans were gradually lengthened to the number of four, five, or even seven, pompous surnames; as for instance, Marcus Mæcius Mæmmius Furius Balburius Cæcilianus Placidus. Norris Cenotaph. Pisan. Dissert. iv. 438.

[3] The *carrucæ*, or coaches of the Romans, were often of solid silver, curiously carved and engraved; and the trappings of the mules, or horses, were embossed with gold. This magnificence continued from the reign of Nero to that of Honorius; and the Appian way was covered with the splendid equipages of the nobles, who came out to meet St. Melania, when she returned to Rome, six years before the Gothic siege (Seneca, epistol. lxxxvii. Plin. Hist. Natur. xxxiii. 49. Paulin. Nolan. apud Baron. Annal. Eccles. A.D. 397. No. 5.). Yet pomp is well exchanged for convenience; and a plain modern coach, that is hung upon springs, is much preferable to the silver or gold *carts* of antiquity, which rolled on the axle-tree, and were exposed, for the most part, to the inclemency of the weather.

[4] In a homily of Asterius, bishop of Amasia, M. de Valois has discovered (Ammian. xiv. 6.) that this was a new fashion; that bears, wolves, lions, and tygers, woods, hunting matches, &c. were represented in embroidery; and that the more pious coxcombs substituted the figure or legend of some favourite saint.

"carriages are continually driving round the immense space of the "city and suburbs. Whenever these persons of high distinction con- "descend to visit the public baths, they assume, on their entrance, "a tone of loud and insolent command, and appropriate to their own "use the conveniencies which were designed for the Roman people. "If, in these places of mixed and general resort, they meet any of "the infamous ministers of their pleasures, they express their affec- "tion by a tender embrace; while they proudly decline the saluta- "tions of their fellow-citizens, who are not permitted to aspire above "the honour of kissing their hands, or their knees. As soon as they "have indulged themselves in the refreshment of the bath, they "resume their rings, and the other ensigns of their dignity; select "from their private wardrobe of the finest linen, such as might suffice "for a dozen persons, the garments the most agreeable to their fancy, "and maintain till their departure the same haughty demeanour; which "perhaps might have been excused in the great Marcellus, after the "conquest of Syracuse. Sometimes, indeed, these heroes undertake "more arduous achievements; they visit their estates in Italy, and "procure themselves, by the toil of servile hands, the amusements of "the chace.[1] If at any time, but more especially on a hot day, they "have courage to sail, in their painted gallies, from the Lucrine lake[2] "to their elegant villas on the sea-coast of Puteoli and Cayeta,[3] they "compare their own expeditions to the marches of Cæsar and Alexan- "der. Yet should a fly presume to settle on the silken folds of their "gilded umbrellas; should a sun-beam penetrate through some un- "guarded and imperceptible chink, they deplore their intolerable hard- "ships, and lament, in affected language, that they were not born in "the land of the Cimmerians,[4] the regions of eternal darkness. In "these journeys into the country,[5] the whole body of the household "marches with their master. In the same maaner as the cavalry and "infantry, the heavy and the light armed troops, the advanced guard and "the rear, are marshalled by the skill of their military leaders; so the "domestic officers, who bear a rod, as an ensign of authority, distri-

[1] Pliny's Epist. i. 6. Three large wild boars were allured and taken in the toils, without interrupting the studies of the philosophic sportsman.

[2] The change from the inauspicious word *Avernus*, which stands in the text, is immaterial. The two lakes, Avernus and Lucrinus, communicated with each other, and were fashioned by the stupendous moles of Agrippa into the Julian port, which opened, through a narrow entrance, into the gulf of Puteoli. Virgil, who resided on the spot, has described (Georgic ii. 161.) this work at the moment of its execution; and his commentators, especially Catrou, have derived much light from Strabo, Suetonius, and Dion. Earthquakes and volcanos have changed the face of the country, and turned the Lucrine lake, since the year 1538, into the Monte Nuovo. Camillo Pellegrino Discorsi della Campania Felice, p. 239. Antonii Sanfelicii Campania, p. 13. 88.

[3] The regna Cumana et Puteolana; loca cæteroqui valde expetenda, interpellantium autem multitudine pœne fugienda. Cicero ad Attic. xvi. 17.

[4] The proverbial expression of *Cimmerian darkness* was originally borrowed from the description of Homer (Odyssey, Book xi.), which he applies to a remote and fabulous country on the shores of the ocean. Erasmi Adagia, in his works, ii. 593. Leyden ed.

[5] We may learn from Seneca, epist. cxxiii. three curious circumstances relative to the journeys of the Romans. 1. They were preceded by a troop of Numidian light-horse, who announced, by a cloud of dust, the approach of a great man. 2. Their baggage mules transported not only the precious vases, but even the fragile vessels of chrystal and *murra*, which last is almost proved, by the learned French translator of Seneca (iii. 402.) to mean the porcelain of China and Japan. 3. The beautiful faces of the young slaves were covered with a medicated crust, or ointment, which secured them against the effects of the sun and frost.

" bute and arrange the numerous train of slaves and attendants. The " baggage and wardrobe move in the front; and are immediately fol- " lowed by a multitude of cooks, and inferior ministers, employed in " the service of the kitchens, and of the table. The main body is com- " posed of a promiscuous crowd of slaves, increased by the accidental " concourse of idle or dependent plebeians. The rear is closed by the " favourite band of eunuchs, distributed from age to youth, according " to the order of seniority. Their numbers, and their deformity, excite " the horror of the indignant spectators, who are ready to execrate the " memory of Semiramis, for the cruel art which she invented, of frus- " trating the purposes of nature, and of blasting in the bud the hopes of " future generations. In the exercise of domestic jurisdiction, the " nobles of Rome express an exquisite sensibility for any personal " injury, and a contemptuous indifference for the rest of the human " species. When they have called for warm water, if a slave has been " tardy in his obedience, he is instantly chastised with three hundred " lashes: but should the same slave commit a wilful murder, the mas- " ter will mildly observe, that he is a worthless fellow; but that, if he " repeats the offence, he shall not escape punishment. Hospitality " was formerly the virtue of the Romans; and every stranger, who " could plead either merit or misfortune, was relieved, or rewarded, by " their generosity. At present, if a foreigner, perhaps of no contempt- " ible rank, is introduced to one of the proud and wealthy senators, he " is welcomed indeed in the first audience, with such warm professions, " and such kind enquiries, that he retires, enchanted with the affability " of his illustrious friend, and full of regret that he had so long delayed " his journey to Rome, the native seat of manners, as well as of empire. " Secure of a favourable reception, he repeats his visit the ensuing day, " and is mortified by the discovery, that his person, his name, and his " country, are already forgotten. If he still has resolution to persevere, " he is gradually numbered in the train of dependents, and obtains the " permission to pay his assiduous and unprofitable court to a haughty " patron, incapable of gratitude or friendship; who scarcely deigns to " remark his presence, his departure, or his return. Whenever the " rich prepare a solemn and popular entertainment;[1] whenever they " celebrate, with profuse and pernicious luxury, their private banquets; " the choice of the guests is the subject of anxious deliberation. The " modest, the sober, and the learned, are seldom preferred; and the " nomenclators, who are commonly swayed by interested motives, have " the address to insert in the list of invitations, the obscure names of " the most worthless of mankind. But the frequent and familiar com- " panions of the great, are those parasites, who practise the most use- " ful of all arts, the art of flattery; who eagerly applaud each word, and " every action, of their immortal patron; gaze with rapture on his

[1] Distributio solemnium sportularum. The *sportulæ*, or *sportellæ*, were small baskets, supposed to contain a quantity of hot provisions, of the value of 100 quadrantes, or twelve-pence halfpenny, which were ranged in order in the hall, and ostentatiously distributed to the hungry or servile crowd, who waited at the door. This indelicate custom is very frequently mentioned in the epigrams of Martial, and the satires of Juvenal. Suetonius, in Claud. c. 21. in Neron. c. 16. in Domitian. c. 4. 7. These baskets of provisions were afterwards converted into large pieces of gold and silver coin, or plate, which were mutually given and accepted even by the persons of the highest rank (Symmach. epist. iv. 55. ix. 124. and Miscell. p. 256.), on solemn occasions, of consulships, marriages, &c.

" marble columns, and variegated pavements; and strenuously praise " the pomp and elegance, which he is taught to consider as a part of his " personal merit. At the Roman tables, the birds, the *squirrels*,[1] or " the fish, which appear of an uncommon size, are contemplated with " curious attention; a pair of scales is accurately applied, to ascertain " their real weight; and, while the more rational guests are disgusted " by the vain and tedious repetition, notaries are summoned to attest, " by an authentic record, the truth of such a marvellous event. " Another method of introduction into the houses and society of the " great, is derived from the profession of gaming, or, as it is more " politely styled, of play. The confederates are united by a strict and " indissoluble bond of friendship, or rather of conspiracy; a superior " degree of skill in the *Tesserarian* art (which may be interpreted the " game of dice and tables[2]) is a sure road to wealth and reputation. " A master of that sublime science, who in a supper, or assembly, is " placed below a magistrate, displays in his countenance the surprise " and indignation, which Cato might be supposed to feel, when he was " refused the prætorship by the votes of a capricious people. The ac- " quisition of knowledge seldom engages the curiosity of the nobles, " who abhor the fatigue, and disdain the advantages, of study; and " the only books which they peruse are the satires of Juvenal, and the " verbose and fabulous histories of Marius Maximus.[3] The libraries, " which they have inherited from their fathers, are secluded, like " dreary sepulchres, from the light of day.[4] But the costly instruments " of the theatre, flutes, and enormous lyres, and hydraulic organs, are " constructed for their use; and the harmony of vocal and instru- " mental music is incessantly repeated in the palaces of Rome. In " those palaces, sound is preferred to sense, and the care of the body " to that of the mind. It is allowed as a salutary maxim, that the " light and frivolous suspicion of a contagious malady, is of sufficient " weight to excuse the visits of the most intimate friends; and even " the servants, who are dispatched to make the decent enquiries, are " not suffered to return home, till they have undergone the ceremony

[1] The want of an English name obliges me to refer to the common genus of squirrels, the Latin *glis*, the French *loir*; a little animal who inhabits the woods, and remains torpid in cold weather. (Plin. Hist. Natur. viii. 82. Buffon, Hist. Natur. viii. 158. Pennant's Synopsis of Quadrupeds, p. 289.) The art of rearing and fattening great numbers of *glires* was practised in Roman villas, as a profitable article of rural economy (Varro, de Re Rusticâ, iii. 15.). The excessive demand of them for luxurious tables, was increased by the foolish prohibitions of the Censors; and it is reported, that they are still esteemed in modern Rome, and are frequently sent as presents by the Colonna princes (Brotier, the last editor of Pliny, ii. 458. apud Barbou, 1779.).

[2] This game, which might be translated by the more familiar names of *trictrac*, or *backgammon*, was a favourite amusement of the gravest Romans; and old Mucius Scævola, the lawyer, had the reputation of a very skilful player. It was called *ludus duodecim scriptorum*, from the twelve *scripta*, or lines, which equally divided the *alveolus*, or table. On these, the two armies, the white and the black, each consisting of fifteen men, or *calculi*, were regularly placed, and alternately moved, according to the laws of the game; and the chances of the *tesseræ*, or dice. Dr. Hyde, who diligently traces the history and varieties of the *nerdiludium* (a name of Persic etymology) from Ireland to Japan, pours forth, on this trifling subject, a copious torrent of classic and Oriental learning. Syntagma Dissert. ii. 217.

[3] Marius Maximus, homo omnium verbosissimus, qui, et mythistoricis se voluminibus implicavit. Vopiscus, in Hist. Aug. p. 242. He wrote the Lives of the Emperors, from Trajan to Alexander Severus. Gerard, Vossius de Historicis Latin. l. ii. c. 3. in his works, iv. 57.

[4] This satire is probably exaggerated. The Saturnalia of Macrobius, and the Epistles of Jerom, afford satisfactory proofs, that Christian theology, and classic literature, were studiously cultivated by several Romans, of both sexes, and of the highest rank.

"of a previous ablution. Yet this selfish and unmanly delicacy occa- "sionally yields to the more imperious passion of avarice. The pros- "pect of gain will urge a rich and gouty senator as far as Spoleto; "every sentiment of arrogance and dignity is subdued by the hopes "of an inheritance, or even of a legacy; and a wealthy childless "citizen is the most powerful of the Romans. The art of obtaining "the signature of a favourable testament, and sometimes of hastening "the moment of its execution, is perfectly understood; and it has "happened, that in the same house, though in different apartments, "a husband and a wife, with the laudable design of over-reaching "each other, have summoned their respective lawyers, to declare, at "the same time, their mutual, but contradictory, intentions. The dis- "tress which follows and chastises extravagant luxury, often reduces "the great to the use of the most humiliating expedients. When "they desire to borrow, they employ the base and supplicating style of "the slave in the comedy; but when they are called upon to pay, they "assume the royal and tragic declamation of the grandsons of Hercules. "If the demand is repeated, they readily procure some trusty sycophant, "instructed to maintain a charge of poison, or magic, against the in- "solent creditor; who is seldom released from prison, till he has "signed a discharge of the whole debt. These vices, which degrade "the moral character of the Romans, are mixed with a puerile super- "stition, that disgraces their understanding. They listen with confi- "dence to the predictions of haruspices, who pretend to read, in the "entrails of victims, the signs of future greatness and prosperity; and "there are many who do not presume either to bathe, or to dine, or to "appear in public, till they have diligently consulted, according to the "rules of astrology, the situation of Mercury, and the aspect of the "moon.[1] It is singular enough, that this vain credulity may often be "discovered among the profane sceptics, who impiously doubt, or "deny, the existence of a celestial power."

In populous cities, which are the seat of commerce and manufactures, the middle ranks of inhabitants, who derive their subsistence from the dexterity, or labour, of their hands, are commonly the most prolific, the most useful, and, in that sense, the most respectable, part of the community. But the plebeians of Rome, who disdained such sedentary and servile arts, had been oppressed, from the earliest times, by the weight of debt and usury; and the husbandman, during the term of his military service, was obliged to abandon the cultivation of his farm.[2] The lands of Italy, which had been originally divided among the families of free and indigent proprietors, were insensibly purchased, or usurped, by the avarice of the nobles; and in the age which preceded the fall of the republic, it was computed, that only two thousand citizens were possessed of any independent substance.[3] Yet as long as

[1] Macrobius, the friend of these Roman nobles, considered the stars as the cause, or at least the signs, of future events (de Somn. Scipion. l. i. c. 19. p. 68.).

[2] The histories of Livy (vi. 36.) are full of the extortions of the rich, and the sufferings of the poor debtors. The melancholy story of a brave old soldier (Dionys. Hal. l. vi. c. 26. p. 347. and Livy, ii. 23.) must have been frequently repeated in those primitive times, which have been so undeservedly praised.

[3] Non esse in civitate duo millia hominum qui rem haberent. Cicero. Offic. ii. 21. and Comment. Paul. Manut. in edit. Græv. This vague computation was made A.U.C. 649. in

the people bestowed, by their suffrages, the honours of the state, the command of the legions, and the administration of wealthy provinces, their conscious pride alleviated, in some measure, the hardships of poverty; and their wants were seasonably supplied by the ambitious liberality of the candidates, who aspired to secure a venal majority in the 35 tribes, or the 193 centuries, of Rome. But when the prodigal commons had imprudently alienated not only the *use*, but the *inheritance*, of power, they sunk, under the reign of the Cæsars, into a vile and wretched populace, which must, in a few generations, have been totally extinguished, if it had not been continually recruited by the manumission of slaves, and the influx of strangers. As early as the time of Hadrian, it was the just complaint of the ingenuous natives, that the capital had attracted the vices of the universe, and the manners of the most opposite nations. The intemperance of the Gauls, the cunning and levity of the Greeks, the savage obstinacy of the Egyptians and Jews, the servile temper of the Asiatics, and the dissolute, effeminate prostitution of the Syrians, were mingled in the various multitude; which, under the proud and false denomination of Romans, presumed to despise their fellow-subjects, and even their sovereigns, who dwelt beyond the precincts of the ETERNAL CITY.[1]

Yet the name of that city was still pronounced with respect: the frequent and capricious tumults of its inhabitants were indulged with impunity; and the successors of Constantine, instead of crushing the last remains of the democracy, by the strong arm of military power, embraced the mild policy of Augustus, and studied to relieve the poverty, and to amuse the idleness, of an innumerable people.[2] I. For the convenience of the lazy plebeians, the monthly distributions of corn were converted into a daily allowance of bread; a great number of ovens was constructed and maintained at the public expence; and at the appointed hour, each citizen, who was furnished with a ticket, ascended the flight of steps, which had been assigned to his peculiar quarter or division, and received, either as a gift, or at a very low price, a loaf of bread of the weight of three pounds, for the use of his family. II. The forests of Lucania, whose acorns fattened large droves of wild hogs,[3] afforded, as a species of tribute, a plentiful

a speech of the tribune Philippus; and it was his object, as well as that of the Gracchi (Plutarch), to deplore, and perhaps to exaggerate, the misery of the common people.

[1] Third Satire (60—125.) of Juvenal, who indignantly complains,

——Quam*vis* quota portio fæcis Achæi! Et linguam et mores, &c.
Jampridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes;

Seneca, when he proposes to comfort his mother (Consolat. ad Helv. c. 6.) by the reflection, that a great part of mankind were in a state of exile, reminds her how few of the inhabitants of Rome were born in the city.

[2] Almost all that is said of the bread, bacon, oil, wine, &c. may be found in Theod. Code, Book xiv.; which expressly treats of the *police* of the great cities. See titles iii. iv. xv. xvi. xvii. xxiv. The collateral testimonies are produced in Godefroy's Commentary, and it is needless to transcribe them. According to a law of Theodosius, which appreciates in money the military allowance, a piece of gold (eleven shillings) was equivalent to 80 pounds of bacon, or to 80 pounds of oil, or to 12 modii (or pecks) of salt (Cod. Theod. l. viii. tit. iv. leg. 17.). This equation, compared with another, of 70 pounds of bacon for an *amphora* (Cod. Theod. l. xiv. tit. iv. leg. 4.), fixes the price of wine at about 16 pence the gallon.

[3] The anonymous author of the Description of the World (p. 14. in v. iii. Geog. Minor, Hudson) observes of Lucania, in his barbarous Latin, Regio optima, et ipsa omnibus habundans, et lardum multum foras emittit. Propter quod est in montibus, cujus æscam animalium variam, &c.

supply of cheap and wholesome meat. During five months of the year, a regular allowance of bacon was distributed to the poorer citizens; and the annual consumption of the capital, at a time when it was much declined from its former lustre, was ascertained, by an edict of Valentinian the Third, at 3,628,000 pounds.[1] III. In the manners of antiquity, the use of oil was indispensable for the lamp, as well as for the bath; and the annual tax, which was imposed on Africa for the benefit of Rome, amounted to the weight of 3,000,000 pounds, to the measure, perhaps, of 300,000 English gallons. IV. The anxiety of Augustus to provide the metropolis with sufficient plenty of corn, was not extended beyond that necessary article of human subsistence; and when the popular clamour accused the dearness and scarcity of wine, a proclamation was issued, by the grave reformer, to remind his subjects, that no man could reasonably complain of thirst, since the aqueducts of Agrippa had introduced into the city so many copious streams of pure and salubrious water.[2] This rigid sobriety was insensibly relaxed; and, although the generous design of Aurelian[3] does not appear to have been executed in its full extent, the use of wine was allowed on very easy and liberal terms. The administration of the public cellars was delegated to a magistrate of honourable rank; and a considerable part of the vintage of Campania was reserved for the fortunate inhabitants of Rome.

The stupendous aqueducts, so justly celebrated by the praises of Augustus himself, replenished the *Thermæ*, or baths, which had been constructed in every part of the city, with Imperial magnificence. The baths of Antoninus Caracalla, which were open, at stated hours, for the indiscriminate service of the senators and the people, contained above 1600 seats of marble; and more than 3000 were reckoned in the baths of Diocletian.—*Olympiodor. apud Phot.* p. 197. The walls of the lofty apartments were covered with curious mosaics, that imitated the art of the pencil in the elegance of design, and the variety of colours. The Egyptian granite was beautifully incrusted with the precious green marble of Numidia; the perpetual stream of hot water was poured into the capacious basons, through so many wide mouths of bright and massy silver; and the meanest Roman could purchase, with a small copper coin, the daily enjoyment of a scene of pomp and luxury, which might excite the envy of the kings of Asia.[4] From these stately palaces issued a swarm of dirty and ragged plebeians, without shoes, and without a mantle; who loitered away whole days in the street or Forum, to hear news, and to hold disputes; who dissipated, in extravagant gaming, the miserable pittance of their wives and chil-

[1] Novell. ad calcem Cod. Theod. D. Valent. l. i. tit. xv. This law was published at Rome, A.D. 452. June 29.

[2] Sueton. in August. c. 42. The utmost debauch of the emperor himself, in his favourite wine of Rhætia, never exceeded a *sectarius* (an English pint). Id. c. 77. Torrentius ad Loc. and Arbuthnot's Tables, p. 86.

[3] His design was to plant vineyards along the sea-coast of Etruria (Vopiscus, Hist. Aug. p. 225.); the dreary, unwholesome, uncultivated *Maremme* of modern Tuscany.

[4] Seneca (epistol. lxxxvi.) compares the baths of Scipio Africanus, at his villa of Liternum, with the magnificence (which was continually increasing) of the public baths of Rome, long before the stately Thermæ of Antoninus and Diocletian were erected. The *quadrans* paid for admission was the quarter of the *as*, about one-eighth of an English penny.

dren; and spent the hours of the night in obscure taverns, and brothels, in the indulgence of gross and vulgar sensuality.[1]

But the most lively and splendid amusement of the idle multitude, depended on the frequent exhibition of public games and spectacles. The piety of Christian princes had suppressed the inhuman combats of gladiators; but the Roman people still considered the Circus as their home, their temple, and the seat of the republic. The impatient crowd rushed at the dawn of day to secure their places, and there were many who passed a sleepless and anxious night in the adjacent porticos. From the morning to the evening, careless of the sun, or of the rain, the spectators, who sometimes amounted to the number of 400,000, remained in eager attention; their eyes fixed on the horses and charioteers, their minds agitated with hope and fear, for the success of the *colours* which they espoused: and the happiness of Rome appeared to hang on the event of a race.[2] The same immoderate ardour inspired their clamours, and their applause, as often as they were entertained with the hunting of wild beasts, and the various modes of theatrical representation. These representations in modern capitals may deserve to be considered as a pure and elegant school of taste, and perhaps of virtue. But the Tragic and Comic Muse of the Romans, who seldom aspired beyond the imitation of Attic genius,[3] had been almost totally silent since the fall of the republic;[4] and their place was unworthily occupied by licentious farce, effeminate music, and splendid pageantry. The pantomimes,[5] who maintained their reputation from the age of Augustus to the sixth century, expressed, without the use of words, the various fables of the gods and heroes of antiquity; and the perfection of their art, which sometimes disarmed the gravity of the philosopher, always excited the applause and wonder of the people. The vast and magnificent theatres of Rome were filled by 3000 female dancers, and by 3000 singers, with the masters of the respective choruses. Such was the popular favour which they enjoyed, that, in a time of scarcity, when all strangers were banished from the city, the merit of contributing to the public pleasures exempted *them* from a law, which was strictly executed against the professors of the liberal arts.[6]

[1] Ammian. (l. xiv. c. 6. and l. xxviii. c. 4.), after describing the luxury and pride of the nobles of Rome, exposes, with equal indignation, the vices and follies of the common people.

[2] Juvenal. Satir. xi. 191. The expressions of the historian Ammianus are not less strong and animated than those of the satirist; and both the one and the other painted from the life. The numbers which the great Circus was capable of receiving, are taken from the *original Notitiæ* of the city. The differences between them prove that they did not transcribe each other; but the sum may appear incredible, though the country on these occasions flocked to the city.

[3] Sometimes indeed they composed original pieces.

——Vestigia Græca Ausi deserere et celebrare domestica facta.

Horat. Epistol. ad Pisones, 285. and the learned, though perplexed, note of Dacier, who might have allowed the name of tragedies to the *Brutus* and the *Decius* of Pacuvius, or to the *Cato* of Maternus. The *Octavia*, ascribed to one of the Senecas, still remains a very unfavourable specimen of Roman tragedy.

[4] In the time of Quintilian and Pliny, a tragic poet was reduced to the imperfect method of hiring a great room, and reading his play to the company, whom he invited for that pur pose (Dialog. de Oratoribus, c. 9. 11. and Plin. Epistol. vii. 17.).

[5] Dialogue of Lucian, intitled, De Saltatione, ii. 265. The pantomimes obtained the honourable name of χειροσοφοι; and it was required, that they should be conversant with almost every art and science. Burette (Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. i. 127.) has given a short history of the art of pantomimes.

[6] Ammian. l. xiv. c. 6. He complains, with decent indignation, that the streets of Rome

It is said, that the foolish curiosity of Elagabalus attempted to discover, from the quantity of spiders' webs, the number of the inhabitants of Rome. A more rational method of enquiry might not have been undeserving of the attention of the wisest princes, who could easily have resolved a question so important for the Roman government, and so interesting to succeeding ages. The births and deaths of the citizens were duly registered; and if any writer of antiquity had condescended to mention the annual amount, or the common average, we might now produce some satisfactory calculation, which would destroy the extravagant assertions of critics, and perhaps confirm the modest and probable conjectures of philosophers.[1] The most diligent researches have collected only the following circumstances; which, slight and imperfect as they are, may tend, in some degree, to illustrate the question of the populousness of ancient Rome. I. When the capital of the empire was besieged by the Goths, the circuit of the walls was accurately measured, by Ammonius, the mathematician, who found it equal to twenty-one miles.[2] It should not be forgotten, that the form of the city was almost that of a circle; the geometrical figure which is known to contain the largest space within any given circumference. II. The architect Vitruvius, who flourished in the Augustan age, and whose evidence, on this occasion, has peculiar weight and authority, observes, that the innumerable habitations of the Roman people would have spread themselves far beyond the narrow limits of the city; and that the want of ground, which was probably contracted on every side by gardens and villas, suggested the common, though inconvenient, practice of raising the houses to a considerable height in the air.[3] But the loftiness of these buildings, which often consisted of hasty work, and insufficient materials, was the cause of frequent and fatal accidents; and it was repeatedly enacted by Augustus, as well as by Nero, that the height of private edifices, within the walls of Rome, should not exceed the measure of seventy feet from the ground.[4] III. Juvenal[5] laments, as it should

were filled with crowds of females, who might have given children to the state, but whose only occupation was to curl and dress their hair, and jactari volubilibus gyris, dum exprimunt innumera simulacra, quæ finxere fabulæ theatrales.

[1] Lipsius (iii. 423. de Magnitud. Romanâ, l. iii. c. 3.) and Isaac Vossius (Observ. Var. p. 26.) have indulged strange dreams of 4, or 8, or 14 millions in Rome. Hume (Essays, i. 450.), with admirable good sense and scepticism, betrays some secret disposition to extenuate the populousness of ancient times.

[2] Olympiodor. ap. Phot. p. 197. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. ix. 400.

[3] In eâ autem majestate urbis, et civium infinitâ frequentiâ innumerabiles habitationes opus fuit explicare. Ergo cum recipere non posset area plana tantam multitudinem in urbe, ad auxilium altitudinis ædificiorum rés ipsa coëgit devenire. Vitruv. ii. 8. This passage, which I owe to Vossius, is clear, strong, and comprehensive.

[4] The successive testimonies of Pliny, Aristides, Claudian, Rutilius, &c. prove the insufficiency of these restrictive edicts. See Lipsius, de Magnitud. Romanâ, l. iii. c. 4.

——— Tabulata tibi jam tertia fumant
Tu nescis; nam si gradibus trepidatur ab imis
Ultimus ardebit, quem tegula sola tuetur.
A pluviâ.
Juvenal. Satir. iii. 199.

[5] Read the whole third satire, but particularly 166. 223, &c. The description of a crowded *insula*, or lodging-house, in Petronius (c. 95. 97.), perfectly tallies with the complaints of Juvenal; and we learn from legal authority, that in the time of Augustus (Heineccius, Hist. Juris Roman. c. iv. 181.), the ordinary rent of the several *cœnacula*, or apartments of an *insula*, annually produced 40,000 sesterces, between three and four hundred pounds sterling (Pandect. l. xix. tit. ii. No. 30.); a sum which proves at once the large extent and high value of those common buildings.

seem from his own experience, the hardships of the poorer citizens, to whom he addresses the salutary advice of emigrating, without delay from the smoke of Rome; since they might purchase, in the little towns of Italy, a cheerful commodious dwelling, at the same price which they annually paid for a dark and miserable lodging. House-rent was therefore immoderately dear: the rich acquired, at an enormous expence, the ground, which they covered with palaces and gardens; but the body of the Roman people was crowded into a narrow space; and the different floors, and apartments, of the same house, were divided, as it is still the custom of Paris, and other cities, among several families of plebeians. IV. The total number of houses in the fourteen regions of the city, is accurately stated in the description of Rome, composed under the reign of Theodosius; and they amount to 48,382.[1] The two classes of *domus* and of *insulæ*, into which they are divided, include all the habitations of the capital, of every rank and condition, from the marble palace of the Anicii, with a numerous establishment of freedmen and slaves, to the lofty and narrow lodging-house, where the poet Codrus, and his wife, were permitted to hire a wretched garret immediately under the tiles. If we adopt the same average, which, under similar circumstances, has been found applicable to Paris,[2] and indifferently allow about 25 persons for each house, of every degree, we may fairly estimate the inhabitants of Rome at 1,200,000: a number which cannot be thought excessive for the capital of a mighty empire, though it exceeds the populousness of the greatest cities of modern Europe.[3]

Such was the state of Rome under the reign of Honorius; at the time when the Gothic army formed (A.D. 408) the siege, or rather the blockade, of the city.[4] By a skilful disposition of his numerous forces, who impatiently watched the moment of an assault, Alaric encompassed the walls, commanded the twelve principal gates, intercepted all communication with the adjacent country, and vigilantly guarded the navigation of the Tyber, from which the Romans derived the surest and most plentiful supply of provisions. The first emotions of the nobles, and of the people, were those of surprise and indignation, that a vile Barbarian should dare to insult the capital of the world: but their arrogance was soon humbled by misfortune; and their unmanly rage, instead of being directed against an enemy in arms, was meanly exercised on a defenceless and innocent victim. Perhaps in the person of Serena, the Romans might have respected the niece of Theodosius, the aunt, nay even the adoptive mother, of the reigning emperor: but they abhorred the widow of Stilicho; and they listened with credulous passion to the tale of calumny, which

[1] This sum total is composed of 1780 *domus*, or great houses, of 46,602 *insulæ*, or plebeian habitations (Nardini, Roma Antica, l. iii. 88.); and these numbers are ascertained by the agreement of the texts of the different *Notitiæ*. Nardini, l. viii. 498.

[2] M. de Messance, Recherch. sur la Popul. p. 175. From probable, or certain grounds, he assigns to Paris 23,565 houses, 71,114 families, and 576,630 inhabitants.

[3] This computation is not very different from that which Brotier, the last editor of Tacitus (ii. 380.), has assumed from similar principles; though he seems to aim at a degree of precision, which is neither possible nor important to obtain.

[4] For the events of the first siege of Rome, which are often confounded with those of the second and third, see Zos. l. v. 350. Soz. l. ix. c. 6. Olympiod. ap. Phot. p. 180. Philostorg. l. xii. c. 3. and Godefroy, 467.

accused her of maintaining a secret and criminal correspondence with the Gothic invader. Actuated, or overawed, by the same popular frenzy, the senate, without requiring any evidence of her guilt, pronounced the sentence of her death. Serena was ignominiously strangled; and the infatuated multitude were astonished to find, that this cruel act of injustice did not immediately produce the retreat of the Barbarians, and the deliverance of the city. That unfortunate city gradually experienced the distress of scarcity, and at length the horrid calamities of famine. The daily allowance of three pounds of bread was reduced to one-half, to one-third, to nothing; and the price of corn still continued to rise in a rapid and extravagant proportion. The poorer citizens, who were unable to purchase the necessaries of life, solicited the precarious charity of the rich; and for a while the public misery was alleviated by the humanity of Læta, the widow of the emperor Gratian, who had fixed her residence at Rome, and consecrated, to the use of the indigent, the princely revenue, which she annually received from the grateful successors of her husband.[1] But these private and temporary donatives were insufficient to appease the hunger of a numerous people; and the progress of famine invaded the marble palaces of the senators themselves. The persons of both sexes, who had been educated in the enjoyment of ease and luxury, discovered how little is requisite to supply the demands of nature; and lavished their unavailing treasures of gold and silver, to obtain the coarse and scanty sustenance which they would formerly have rejected with disdain. The food the most repugnant to sense or imagination, the aliments the most unwholesome and pernicious to the constitution, were eagerly devoured, and fiercely disputed, by the rage of hunger. A dark suspicion was entertained, that some desperate wretches fed on the bodies of their fellow-creatures, whom they had secretly murdered; and even mothers (such was the horrid conflict of the two most powerful instincts implanted by nature in the human breast), even mothers are said to have tasted the flesh of their slaughtered infants![2] Many thousands of the inhabitants of Rome expired in their houses, or in the streets, for want of sustenance; and as the public sepulchres without the walls were in the power of the enemy, the stench, which arose from so many putrid and unburied carcasses, infected the air; and the miseries of famine were succeeded and aggravated by the contagion of a pestilential disease. The assurances of speedy and effectual relief, which were repeatedly transmitted from the court of Ravenna, supported, for some time, the fainting resolution of the Romans, till at length the despair of any human aid tempted them to accept the offers of a præternatural deliverance. Pompeianus, præfect of the city, had been persuaded, by the art or fanaticism of some Tuscan diviners, that, by the mysterious force of

[1] The mother of Læta was named Pissumena. Her father, family, and country are unknown. Ducange, Fam. Byzantin. p. 59.

[2] Ad nefandos cibos erupit esurientium rabies, et sua invicem membra laniarunt, dum mater non parcit lactenti infantiæ; et recipit utero, quem paullò ante effuderat. Jerom ad Principiam, i. 121. The same horrid circumstance is likewise told of the sieges of Jerusalem and Paris. For the latter, compare the Henriade, Book x. and the Journal de Henri IV. i. 47.; and observe that a plain narrative of facts is much more pathetic than the most laboured descriptions of epic poetry.

spells and sacrifices, they could extract the lightning from the clouds, and point those celestial fires against the camp of the Barbarians.' The important secret was communicated to Innocent, the bishop of Rome; and the successor of St. Peter is accused, perhaps without foundation, of preferring the safety of the republic to the rigid severity of the Christian worship. But when the question was agitated in the senate; when it was proposed, as an essential condition, that those sacrifices should be performed in the Capitol, by the authority, and in the presence of, the magistrates; the majority of that respectable assembly, apprehensive either of the Divine, or of the Imperial, displeasure, refused to join in an act, which appeared almost equivalent to the public restoration of Paganism.[2]

The last resource of the Romans was in the clemency, or at least in the moderation, of the king of the Goths. The senate, who in this emergency assumed the supreme powers of government, appointed two ambassadors to negociate with the enemy. This important trust was (A.D. 409) delegated to Basilius, a senator, of Spanish extraction, and already conspicuous in the administration of provinces; and to John, the first tribune of the notaries, who was peculiarly qualified, by his dexterity in business, as well as by his former intimacy with the Gothic prince. When they were introduced into his presence, they declared, perhaps in a more lofty style than became their abject condition, that the Romans were resolved to maintain their dignity, either in peace or war; and that, if Alaric refused them a fair and honourable capitulation, he might sound his trumpets, and prepare to give battle to an innumerable people, exercised in arms, and animated by despair. "The thicker the hay, the easier it is mowed," was the concise reply of the Barbarian; and this rustic metaphor was accompanied by a loud and insulting laugh, expressive of his contempt for the menaces of an unwarlike populace, enervated by luxury before they were emaciated by famine. He then condescended to fix the ransom, which he would accept as the price of his retreat from the walls of Rome: *all* the gold and silver in the city, whether it were the property of the state, or of individuals; *all* the rich and precious moveables; and *all* the slaves who could prove their title to the name of *Barbarians*. The ministers of the senate presumed to ask, in a modest and suppliant tone, "If such, O King, are your demands, what "do you intend to leave us?" "YOUR LIVES;" replied the haughty conqueror: they trembled, and retired. Yet before they retired, a

[1] Zos. (l. v. 355.) speaks of these ceremonies, like a Greek unacquainted with the national superstition of Rome and Tuscany. I suspect, that they consisted of two parts, the secret, and the public; the former were probably an imitation of the arts and spells, by which Numa had drawn down Jupiter and his thunder on Mount Aventine.

——— Quid agant laqueis, quæ carmina dicant
Quâque trahant superis sedibus arte Jovem
Scire nefas homini.

The *ancilia*, or shields of Mars, the *pignora Imperii*, which were carried in solemn procession on the calends of March, derived their origin from this mysterious event (Ovid. Fast. iii. 259.). It was probably designed to revive this ancient festival, which had been suppressed by Theodosius. In that case, we recover a chronological date (Mar. 1. A.D. 409.) which has not hitherto been observed.

[2] Soz. (l. ix. c. 6.) insinuates, that the experiment was actually, though unsuccessfully, made; but he does not mention the name of Innocent: and Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. x. 645.) is determined not to believe, that a pope could be guilty of such impious condescension.

short suspension of arms was granted, which allowed some time for a more temperate negociation. The stern features of Alaric were insensibly relaxed; he abated much of the rigour of his terms; and at length consented to raise the siege, on the immediate payment of 5000 pounds of gold, of 30,000 pounds of silver, of 4000 robes of silk, of 3000 pieces of fine scarlet cloth, and of 3000 pounds weight of pepper.[1] But the public treasury was exhausted; the annual rents of the great estates in Italy and the provinces, were intercepted by the calamities of war; the gold and gems had been exchanged, during the famine, for the vilest sustenance; the hoards of secret wealth were still concealed by the obstinacy of avarice; and some remains of consecrated spoils afforded the only resource that could avert the impending ruin of the city. As soon as the Romans had satisfied the rapacious demands of Alaric, they were restored, in some measure, to the enjoyment of peace and plenty. Several of the gates were cautiously opened; the importation of provisions from the river, and the adjacent country, was no longer obstructed by the Goths; the citizens resorted in crowds to the free market, which was held during three days in the suburbs; and while the merchants who undertook this gainful trade, made a considerable profit, the future subsistence of the city was secured by the ample magazines which were deposited in the public and private granaries. A more regular discipline, than could have been expected, was maintained in the camp of Alaric; and the wise Barbarian justified his regard for the faith of treaties, by the just severity with which he chastised a party of licentious Goths, who had insulted some Roman citizens on the road to Ostia. His army, enriched by the contributions of the capital, slowly advanced into the fair and fruitful province of Tuscany, where he proposed to establish his winter-quarters; and the Gothic standard became the refuge of 40,000 Barbarian slaves, who had broke their chains, and aspired, under the command of their great deliverer, to revenge the injuries, and the disgrace, of their cruel servitude. About the same time, he received a more honourable reinforcement of Goths and Huns, whom Adolphus,[2] the brother of his wife, had conducted, at his pressing invitation, from the banks of the Danube to those of the Tyber; and who had cut their way, with some difficulty and loss, through the superior numbers of the Imperial troops. A victorious leader, who united the daring spirit of a Barbarian with the art and discipline of a Roman general, was at the head of 100,000 fighting men; and Italy pronounced, with terror and respect, the formidable name of Alaric.[3]

At the distance of fourteen centuries, we may be satisfied with re-

[1] Pepper was a favourite ingredient of the most expensive Roman cookery, and the best sort commonly sold for fifteen denarii, or ten shillings, the pound. Pliny, Hist. Natur. xii. 14. It was brought from India; and the same country, the coast of Malabar, still affords the greatest plenty: but the improvement of trade and navigation has multiplied the quantity, and reduced the price. Hist. Polit. et Philos. i. 457.

[2] This Gothic chieftain is called by Jornandes and Isidore, *Athaulphus*; by Zos. and Oros. *Ataulphus*; and by Olympiod. *Adaoulphus*. I have used the celebrated name of *Adolphus*, which seems to be authorized by the practice of the Swedes, the sons or brothers of the ancient Goths.

[3] The treaty between Alaric and the Romans, &c. is taken from Zos. l. v. p. 354. The additional circumstances are too few and trifling to require any other quotation.

lating the military exploits of the conquerors of Rome, without presuming to investigate the motives of their political conduct. In the midst of his apparent prosperity, Alaric (A.D. 409) was conscious. perhaps, of some secret weakness, some internal defect; or perhaps the moderation which he displayed, was intended only to deceive and disarm the easy credulity of the ministers of Honorius. The king of the Goths repeatedly declared, that it was his desire to be considered as the friend of peace, and of the Romans. Three senators, at his earnest request, were sent ambassadors to the court of Ravenna, to solicit the exchange of hostages, and the conclusion of the treaty; and the proposals, which he more clearly expressed during the course of the nogociations, could only inspire a doubt of his sincerity, as they might seem inadequate to the state of his fortune. The Barbarian still aspired to the rank of master-general of the armies of the West; he stipulated an annual subsidy of corn and money; and he chose the provinces of Dalmatia, Noricum, and Venetia, for the seat of his new kingdom, which would have commanded the important communication between Italy and the Danube. If these modest terms should be rejected, Alaric showed a disposition to relinquish his pecuniary demands, and even to content himself with the possession of Noricum; an exhausted and impoverished country, perpetually exposed to the inroads of the Barbarians of Germany.—*Zos.* l. v. 367. But the hopes of peace were disappointed by the weak obstinacy, or interested views, of the minister Olympius. Without listening to the salutary remonstrances of the senate, he dismissed their ambassadors under the conduct of a military escort, too numerous for a retinue of honour and too feeble for an army of defence. Six thousand Dalmatians, the flower of the Imperial legions, were ordered to march from Ravenna to Rome, through an open country, which was occupied by the formidable myriads of the Barbarians. These brave legionaries, encompassed and betrayed, fell a sacrifice to ministerial folly; their general, Valens, with 100 soldiers, escaped from the field of battle; and one of the ambassadors, who could no longer claim the protection of the law of nations, was obliged to purchase his freedom with a ransom of 30,000 pieces of gold. Yet Alaric, instead of resenting this act of impotent hostility, immediately renewed his proposals of peace: and the second embassy of the Roman senate, which derived weight and dignity from the presence of Innocent, bishop of the city, was guarded from the dangers of the road by a detachment of Gothic soldiers.[1]

Olympius[2] might have continued to insult the just resentment of a people, who loudly accused him as the author of the public calamities; but his power was undermined by the secret intrigues of the palace. The favourite eunuchs transferred the government of Honorius, and the empire, to Jovius, the Prætorian præfect; an unworthy servant, who did not atone, by the merit of personal attachment, for the errors and misfortunes of his administration. The exile, or escape, of the

[1] Zos. l. v. 360. The bishop, by remaining at Ravenna, escaped the impending calamities of the city. Oros. l. vii. c. 39. p. 573.

[2] For the adventures of Olympius, and his successors in the ministry, Zos. l. v. 363 and Olympiodor. ap. Phot. p. 180.

guilty Olympius, reserved him for more vicissitudes of fortune: he experienced the adventures of an obscure and wandering life; he again rose to power; he fell a second time into disgrace; his ears were cut off; he expired under the lash; and his ignominious death afforded a grateful spectacle to the friends of Stilicho. After the removal of Olympius, whose character was deeply tainted with religious fanaticism, the Pagans and heretics were delivered from the impolitic proscription, which excluded them from the dignities of the state. The brave Gennerid,[1] a soldier of Barbarian origin, who still adhered to the worship of his ancestors, had been obliged to lay aside the military belt: and though he was repeatedly assured by the emperor himself, that laws were not made for persons of his rank or merit, he refused to accept any partial dispensation, and persevered in honourable disgrace, till he had extorted a general act of justice from the distress of the Roman government. The conduct of Gennerid, in the important station, to which he was promoted or restored, of master-general of Dalmatia, Pannonia, Noricum, and Rhætia, seemed to revive the discipline and spirit of the republic. From a life of idleness and want, his troops were soon habituated to severe exercise and plentiful subsistence; and his private generosity often supplied the rewards, which were denied by the avarice, or poverty, of the court of Ravenna. The valour of Gennerid, formidable to the adjacent Barbarians, was the firmest bulwark of the Illyrian frontier; and his vigilant care assisted the empire with a reinforcement of 10,000 Huns, who arrived on the confines of Italy, attended by such a convoy of provisions, and such a numerous train of sheep and oxen, as might have been sufficient, not only for the march of an army, but for the settlement of a colony. But the court and councils of Honorius still remained a scene of weakness and distraction, of corruption and anarchy. Instigated by the præfect Jovius, the guards rose in furious mutiny, and demanded the heads of two generals, and of the two principal eunuchs. The generals, under a perfidious promise of safety, were sent on ship-board, and privately executed; while the favour of the eunuchs procured them a mild and secure exile at Milan and Constantinople. Eusebius the eunuch, and the Barbarian Allobich, succeeded to the command of the bed-chamber and of the guards; and the mutual jealousy of these subordinate ministers was the cause of their mutual destruction. By the insolent order of the count of the domestics, the great chamberlain was shamefully beaten to death with sticks, before the eyes of the astonished emperor; and the subsequent assassination of Allobich, in the midst of a public procession, is the only circumstance of his life, in which Honorius discovered the faintest symptom of courage or resentment. Yet before they fell, Eusebius and Allobich had contributed their part to the ruin of the empire, by opposing the conclusion of a treaty which Jovius, from a selfish, and perhaps a criminal, motive, had negociated with Alaric, in a personal interview under the walls of Rimini. During the absence of Jovius, the emperor was persuaded to assume a lofty

[1] Zos. (l. v. 364.) relates this circumstance with visible complacency, and celebrates the character of Gennerid as the last glory of expiring paganism. Very different were the sentiments of the council of Carthage, who deputed four bishops to the court of Ravenna, to complain of the law, which had been just enacted, that all conversions to Christianity should be free and voluntary. Baron. Annal. Eccles. A.D. 409. No. 12. A.D. 410. No. 47, 48.

tone of inflexible dignity, such as neither his situation, nor his character, could enable him to support: and a letter, signed with the name of Honorius, was immediately dispatched to the Prætorian præfect, granting him a free permission to dispose of the public money, but sternly refusing to prostitute the military honours of Rome to the proud demands of a Barbarian. This letter was imprudently communicated to Alaric himself; and the Goth, who in the whole transaction had behaved with temper and decency, expressed, in the most outrageous language, his lively sense of the insult so wantonly offered to his person, and to his nation. The conference of Rimini was hastily interrupted; and the præfect Jovius, on his return to Ravenna, was compelled to adopt, and even to encourage, the fashionable opinions of the court. By his advice and example, the principal officers of the state and army were obliged to swear, that, without listening, in *any* circumstances, to *any* conditions of peace, they would still persevere in perpetual and implacable war against the enemy of the republic. This rash engagement opposed an insuperable bar to all future negociation. The ministers of Honorius were heard to declare, that, if they had only invoked the name of the Deity, they would consult the public safety, and trust their souls to the mercy of Heaven: but they had sworn, by the sacred head of the emperor himself; they had touched, in solemn ceremony, that august seat of majesty and wisdom; and the violation of their oath would expose them to the temporal penalties of sacrilege and rebellion.[1]

While the emperor and his court enjoyed, with sullen pride, the security of the marshes and fortifications of Ravenna, they (A.D. 409) abandoned Rome, almost without defence, to the resentment of Alaric. Yet such was the moderation which he still preserved, or affected, that, as he moved with his army along the Flaminian way, he successively dispatched the bishops of the towns of Italy to reiterate his offers of peace, and to conjure the emperor, that he would save the city and its inhabitants from hostile fire, and the sword of the Barbarians.[2] These impending calamities were however averted, not indeed by the wisdom of Honorius, but by the prudence or humanity of the Gothic king; who employed a milder, though not less effectual, method of conquest. Instead of assaulting the capital, he successively directed his efforts against the *Port* of Ostia, one of the boldest and most stupendous works of Roman magnificence.[3] The accidents to which the precarious subsistence of the city was continually exposed in a winter-navigation, and an open roadstead, had suggested to the genius of the first Cæsar the useful design, which was executed under

[1] Zos. l. v. 367. This custom of swearing by the head, or life, or safety, or genius, of the sovereign, was of the highest antiquity, both in Egypt (Genesis xlii. 15.) and Scythia. It was soon transferred, by flattery, to the Cæsars; and Tertullian complains that it was the only oath which the Romans of his time affected to reverence. Dissert. of Abbé Massieu on the Oaths of the Ancients, in the Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscript. i. 208.

[2] Zos. l. v. 368. I have softened the expressions of Alaric, who expatiates, in too florid a manner, on the history of Rome.

[3] Sueton. in Claud. c. 20. Dion Cassius, l. lx. 949. and the lively description of Juvenal, Satir. xii. 75, &c. In the sixteenth century, when the remains of this Augustan port were still visible, the antiquarians sketched the plan (d'Anville, Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscript. xxx. 198.), and declared, with enthusiasm, that all the monarchs of Europe would be unable to execute so great a work (Bergier, Hist. des grands Chemins des Romains, ii. 356.).

the reign of Claudius. The artificial moles, which formed the narrow entrance, advanced far into the sea, and firmly repelled the fury of the waves, while the largest vessels securely rode at anchor within three deep and capacious basons, which received the northern branch of the Tyber, about two miles from the ancient colony of Ostia.[1] The Roman *Port* insensibly swelled to the size of an episcopal city,[2] where the corn of Africa was deposited in spacious granaries for the use of the capital. As soon as Alaric was in possession of that important place, he summoned the city to surrender at discretion; and his demands were enforced by the positive declaration, that a refusal, or even a delay, should be instantly followed by the destruction of the magazines, on which the life of the Roman people depended. The clamours of that people, and the terror of famine, subdued the pride of the senate; they listened, without reluctance, to the proposal of placing a new emperor on the throne of the unworthy Honorius; and the suffrage of the Gothic conqueror bestowed the purple on Attalus præfect of the city. The grateful monarch immediately acknowledged his protector as master-general of the armies of the West; Adolphus, with the rank of count of the domestics, obtained the custody of the person of Attalus; and the two hostile nations seemed to be united in the closest bands of friendship and alliance.[3]

The gates of the city were thrown open, and the new emperor of the Romans, encompassed on every side by the Gothic arms, was conducted, in tumultuous procession, to the palace of Augustus and Trajan. After he had distributed the civil and military dignities among his favourites and followers, Attalus convened an assembly of the senate; before whom, in a formal and florid speech, he asserted his resolution of restoring the majesty of the republic, and of uniting to the empire the provinces of Egypt and the East, which had once acknowledged the sovereignty of Rome. Such extravagant promises inspired every reasonable citizen with a just contempt for the character of an unwarlike usurper; whose elevation was the deepest and most ignominious wound which the republic had yet sustained from the insolence of the Barbarians. But the populace, with their usual levity,

[1] The *Ostia Tyberina* (Cluver. Italia Antiq. l. iii. 870.), in the plural number, the two mouths of the Tyber, were separated by the Holy Island, an equilateral triangle, whose sides were each of them computed at about two miles. The colony of Ostia was founded immediately beyond the left or southern, and the *Port* immediately beyond the right, or northern, branch of the river; and the distance between their remains measures something more than two miles on Cingolani's map. In the time of Strabo, the sand and mud deposited by the Tyber, had choked the harbour of Ostia; the progress of the same cause has added much to the size of the Holy Island, and gradually left both Ostia and the Port at a considerable distance from the shore. The dry channels (fiumi morti), and the large estuaries (stagno di Ponente, de Levante), mark the changes of the river, and the efforts of the sea. Consult, for the present state of this dreary and desolate tract, the excellent map of the ecclesiastical state by the mathematicians of Benedict XIV.; an actual survey of the *Agro Romano*, in six sheets, by Cingolani, which contains 113,819 *rubbia* (about 570,000 acres); and the large topographical map of Ameti, in eight sheets.

[2] As early as the third (Lardner's Credib. of the Gospel, part ii. vol. iii. 89.), or at least the fourth, century (Carol. a St. Paulo, Notit. Eccles. p. 47.), the Port of Rome was an episcopal city, which was demolished, as it should seem, in the ninth century, by pope Gregory IV. during the incursions of the Arabs. It is now reduced to an inn, a church, and the house, or palace, of the bishop, who ranks as one of six cardinal bishops of the Roman church. Eschinard, Descriz. di Roma et dell' Agro Romano, p. 328.

[3] For the elevation of Attalus, Zos. l. vi. 377. Soz. l. ix. c. 8, 9. Olympiodor. ap. Phot. p. 180. Philostorg. l. xii. c. 3. and Godefroy, p. 470.

applauded the change of masters. The public discontent was favourable to the rival of Honorius; and the sectaries, oppressed by his persecuting edicts, expected some degree of countenance, or at least of toleration, from a prince, who, in his native country of Ionia, had been educated in the Pagan superstition, and who had since received the sacrament of baptism from the hands of an Arian bishop.[1] The first days of the reign of Attalus were fair and prosperous. An officer of confidence was sent with an inconsiderable body of troops to secure the obedience of Africa; the greatest part of Italy submitted to the terror of the Gothic powers; and though the city of Bologna made a vigorous and effectual resistance, the people of Milan, dissatisfied perhaps with the absence of Honorius, accepted, with loud acclamations, the choice of the Roman senate. At the head of a formidable army, Alaric conducted his royal captive almost to the gates of Ravenna; and a solemn embassy of the principal ministers, of Jovius, the Pretorian præfect, of Valens, master of the cavalry and infantry, of the quæstor Potamius, and of Julian, the first of the notaries, was introduced, with martial pomp, into the Gothic camp. In the name of their sovereign, they consented to acknowledge the lawful election of his competitor, and to divide the provinces of Italy and the West between the two emperors. Their proposals were rejected with disdain; and the refusal was aggravated by the insulting clemency of Attalus, who condescended to promise, that, if Honorius would instantly resign the purple, he should be permitted to pass the remainder of his life in the peaceful exile of some remote island.[2] So desperate indeed did the situation of the son of Theodosius appear, to those who were the best acquainted with his strength and resources, that Jovius and Valens, his minister and his general, betrayed their trust, infamously deserted the sinking cause of their benefactor, and devoted their treacherous allegiance to the service of his more fortunate rival. Astonished by such examples of domestic treason, Honorius trembled at the approach of every servant, at the arrival of every messenger. He dreaded the secret enemies, who might lurk in his capital, his palace, his bed-chamber; and some ships lay ready in the harbour of Ravenna, to transport the abdicated monarch to the dominions of his infant nephew, the emperor of the East.

But there *is* a Providence (such at least was the opinion of the historian Procopius, *de Bell. Vandal.* l. i. c. 2) that watches over innocence and folly; and the pretensions of Honorius to its peculiar care cannot reasonably be disputed. At the moment (A.D. 410) when his despair, incapable of any wise or manly resolution, meditated a shameful flight, a seasonable reinforcement of 4000 veterans unexpectedly landed in the port of Ravenna. To these valiant strangers, whose fidelity had not been corrupted by the factions of the court, he

[1] We may admit the evidence of Sozomen for the Arian baptism, and that of Philostorgius for the Pagan education, of Attalus. The visible joy of Zosimus, and the discontent which he imputes to the Anician family, are very unfavourable to the Christianity of the new emperor.

[2] He carried his insolence so far, as to declare, that he should mutilate Honorius before he sent him into exile. But this assertion of Zosimus is destroyed by the more impartial testimony of Olympiodorus, who attributes the ungenerous proposal (which was absolutely rejected by Attalus) to the baseness, and perhaps the treachery, of Jovius.

committed the walls and gates of the city; and the slumbers of the emperor were no longer disturbed by the apprehension of imminent and internal danger. The favourable intelligence which was received from Africa, suddenly changed the opinions of men, and the state of public affairs. The troops and officers, whom Attalus had sent into that province, were defeated and slain; and the active zeal of Heraclian maintained his own allegiance, and that of his people. The faithful count of Africa transmitted a large sum of money, which fixed the attachment of the Imperial guards; and his vigilance, in preventing the exportation of corn and oil, introduced famine, tumult, and discontent, into the walls of Rome. The failure of the African expedition, was the source of mutual complaint and recrimination in the party of Attalus; and the mind of his protector was insensibly alienated from the interest of a prince, who wanted spirit to command, or docility to obey. The most imprudent measures were adopted without the knowledge, or against the advice, of Alaric; and the obstinate refusal of the senate to allow, in the embarkation, the mixture even of 500 Goths, betrayed a suspicious and distrustful temper, which, in their situation, was neither generous nor prudent. The resentment of the Gothic king was exasperated by the malicious arts of Jovius, who had been raised to the rank of patrician, and who afterwards excused his double perfidy, by declaring, without a blush, that he had only *seemed* to abandon the service of Honorius, more effectually to ruin the cause of the usurper. In a large plain near Rimini, and in the presence of an innumerable multitude of Romans and Barbarians, the wretched Attalus was publicly despoiled of the diadem and purple; and those ensigns of royalty were sent by Alaric, as the pledge of peace and friendship, to the son of Theodosius.[1] The officers who returned to their duty, were reinstated in their employments, and even the merit of a tardy repentance was graciously allowed; but the degraded emperor of the Romans, desirous of life, and insensible of disgrace, implored the permission of following the Gothic camp, in the train of a haughty and capricious Barbarian.[2]

The degradation of Attalus removed the only real obstacle to the conclusion of the peace; and Alaric advanced within three miles of Ravenna, to press the irresolution of the Imperial ministers, whose insolence soon returned with the return of fortune. His indignation was kindled by the report, that a rival chieftain, that Sarus, the personal enemy of Adolphus, and the hereditary foe of the house of Balti, had been received into the palace. At the head of 300 followers, that fearless Barbarian immediately sallied (A.D. 410. Aug. 24) from the gates of Ravenna; surprised, and cut in pieces, a considerable body of Goths; re-entered the city in triumph; and was permitted to insult his adversary, by the voice of a herald, who publicly declared that the guilt of Alaric had for ever excluded him from the friendship and alliance of the emperor.[3] The crime and folly of the court of Ravenna

[1] See the cause and circumstances of the fall of Attalus in Zos. l. vi. 380. Soz. l. ix. c. 8. Philostorg. l. xii. c. 3. The two acts of indemnity in the Theod. Code, l. ix. tit. xxxviii. leg. 11. 22. which were published Feb. 12, and August 8, A.D. 410, evidently relate to this usurper.

[2] In hoc, Alaricus, imperatore, facto, infecto, refecto, ac defecto. . . . . Mimum risit, et ludum spectavit imperii. Oros. l. vii. c. 42. 582.

[3] Zos. l. vi. 384. Soz. l. ix. c. 9. Philostorg. l. xii. c. 3. In this place the text of Zosimus

was expiated, a third time, by the calamities of Rome. The king of the Goths, who no longer dissembled his appetite for plunder and revenge, appeared in arms under the walls of the capital; and the trembling senate, without any hopes of relief, prepared, by a desperate resistance, to delay the ruin of their country. But they were unable to guard against the secret conspiracy of their slaves and domestics; who, either from birth or interest, were attached to the cause of the enemy. At the hour of midnight, the Salarian gate was silently opened, and the inhabitants were awakened by the tremendous sound of the Gothic trumpet. Eleven hundred and sixty-three years after the foundation of Rome, the Imperial city, which had subdued and civilized so considerable a part of mankind, was delivered to the licentious fury of the tribes of Germany and Scythia.[1]

The proclamation of Alaric, when he forced his entrance into a vanquished city, discovered, however, some regard for the laws of humanity and religion. He encouraged his troops boldly to seize the rewards of valour, and to enrich themselves with the spoils of a wealthy and effeminate people: but he exhorted them, at the same time, to spare the lives of the unresisting citizens, and to respect the churches of the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul as holy and inviolable sanctuaries. Amidst the horrors of a nocturnal tumult, several of the Christian Goths displayed the fervour of a recent conversion; and some instances of their uncommon piety and moderation are related, and perhaps adorned, by the zeal of ecclesiastical writers.[2] While the Barbarians roamed through the city in quest of prey, the humble dwelling of an aged virgin, who had devoted her life to the service of the altar, was forced open by one of the powerful Goths. He immediately demanded, though in civil language, all the gold and silver in her possession; and was astonished at the readiness with which she conducted him to a splendid hoard of massy plate, of the richest materials, and the most curious workmanship. The Barbarian viewed with wonder and delight this valuable acquisition, till he was interrupted by a serious admonition, addressed to him in the following words: "These," said she, "are the consecrated vessels belonging to St. Peter; if you presume to touch them, the sacrilegious deed will remain on your conscience. For my part, I dare not keep what I am unable to defend." The Gothic captain, struck with reverential awe, dispatched a messenger to inform the king of the treasure which he had discovered;

is mutilated, and we have lost the remainder of his sixth and last book, which ended with the sack of Rome. Credulous and partial as he is, we must take our leave of that historian with some regret.

[1] Adest Alaricus, trepidam Romam obsidet, turbat, irrumpit. Oros. l. vii. c. 39. p. 573. He dispatches this great event in seven words; but he employs whole pages in celebrating the devotion of the Goths. I have extracted from an improbable story of Procopius, the circumstances which had an air of probability. Procop. de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 2. He supposes, that the city was surprised while the senators slept in the afternoon; but Jerom, with more authority and more reason, affirms, that it was in the night, nocte Moab capta est; nocte cecidit murus ejus, i. 121. ad Principiam.

[2] Oros. (l. vii. c. 39. p. 573.) applauds the piety of the Christian Goths, without seeming to perceive that the greatest part of them were Arian heretics. Jornan. (c. 30. p. 653.) and Isidore of Seville (Chron. p. 714. ed. Grot.), who were both attached to the Gothic cause, have repeated and embellished these edifying tales. According to Isidore, Alaric himself was heard to say, that he waged war with the Romans, and not with the apostles. Such was the style of the seventh century; 200 years before, the fame and merit had been ascribed, not to the apostles, but to Christ.

and received a peremptory order from Alaric, that all the consecrated plate and ornaments should be transported, without damage or delay, to the church of the apostle. From the extremity, perhaps, of the Quirinal hill, to the distant quarter of the Vatican, a numerous detachment of Goths, marching in order of battle through the principal streets, protected, with glittering arms, the long train of their devout companions, who bore aloft, on their heads, the sacred vessels of gold and silver; and the martial shouts of the Barbarians were mingled with the sound of religious psalmody. From all the adjacent houses, a crowd of Christians hastened to join this edifying procession; and a multitude of fugitives, without distinction of age, or rank, or even of sect, had the good fortune to escape to the secure and hospitable sanctuary of the Vatican. The learned work, concerning the *City of God*, was professedly composed by St. Augustin, to justify the ways of Providence in the destruction of the Roman greatness. He celebrates, with peculiar satisfaction, this memorable triumph of Christ; and insults his adversaries, by challenging them to produce some similar example, of a town taken by storm, in which the fabulous gods of antiquity had been able to protect either themselves, or their deluded votaries.[1]

In the sack of Rome, some rare and extraordinary examples of Barbarian virtue had been deservedly applauded. But the holy precincts of the Vatican, and the apostolic churches, could receive a very small proportion of the Roman people: many thousand warriors, more especially of the Huns, who served under the standard of Alaric, were strangers to the name, or at least to the faith, of Christ; and we may suspect, without any breach of charity or candour, that, in the hour of savage licence, when every passion was inflamed, and every restraint was removed, the precepts of the gospel seldom influenced the behaviour of the Gothic Christians. The writers, the best disposed to exaggerate their clemency, have freely confessed, that a cruel slaughter was made of the Romans;[2] and that the streets of the city were filled with dead bodies, which remained without burial during the general consternation. The despair of the citizens was sometimes converted into fury; and whenever the Barbarians were provoked by opposition, they extended the promiscuous massacre to the feeble, the innocent, and the helpless. The private revenge of 40,000 slaves was exercised without pity or remorse; and the ignominious lashes, which they had formerly received, were washed away in the blood of the guilty, or obnoxious, families. The matrons and virgins of Rome were exposed to injuries more dreadful, in the apprehension of chastity, than death itself; and the ecclesiastical historian has selected an example of

[1] August. de Civ. Dei, l. i. c. 1—16. He particularly appeals to the examples of Troy, Syracuse, and Tarentum.

[2] Jerom (i. 121. ad Principiam) has applied to the sack of Rome all the strong expressions of Virgil:

Quis cladem illius noctis, quis funera fando, Explicet, &c.

Procop. (l. i. c. 2.) positively affirms that great numbers were slain by the Goths. Aug. (de Civ. Dei, l. i. c. 12, 13.) offers Christian comfort for the death of those, whose bodies (*multa corpora*) had remained (*in tantâ strage*) unburied. Baronius, from the different writings of the Fathers, has thrown some light on the sack of Rome. Annal. Eccles. A.D. 410. No. 16—44.

female virtue, for the admiration of future ages.[1] A Roman lady, of singular beauty and orthodox faith, had excited the impatient desires of a young Goth, who, according to the sagacious remark of Sozomen, was attached to the Arian heresy. Exasperated by her obstinate resistance, he drew his sword, and, with the anger of a lover, slightly wounded her neck. The bleeding heroine still continued to brave his resentment, and to repel his love, till the ravisher desisted from his unavailing efforts, respectfully conducted her to the sanctuary of the Vatican, and gave six pieces of gold to the guards of the church, on condition that they should restore her inviolate to the arms of her husband. Such instances of courage and generosity were not extremely common. The brutal soldiers satisfied their sensual appetites, without consulting either the inclination, or the duties, of their female captives. There were other losses of a more general concern. Avarice is an insatiate and universal passion; since the enjoyment of almost every object that can afford pleasure to the different tastes and tempers of mankind, may be procured by the possession of wealth. In the pillage of Rome, a just preference was given to gold and jewels, which contain the greatest value in the smallest compass and weight: but, after these portable riches had been removed by the more diligent robbers, the palaces of Rome were rudely stripped of their splendid and costly furniture. The side-boards of massy plate, and the variegated wardrobes of silk and purple, were irregularly piled in the waggons, that always followed the march of a Gothic army. The most exquisite works of art were roughly handled, or wantonly destroyed: many a statue was melted for the sake of the precious materials; and many a vase, in the division of the spoil, was shivered into fragments by the stroke of a battle-axe. The acquisition of riches served only to stimulate the avarice of the rapacious Barbarians, who proceeded, by threats, by blows, and by tortures, to force from their prisoners the confession of hidden treasure.[2] Visible splendour and expence were alleged as the proof of a plentiful fortune; the appearance of poverty was imputed to a parsimonious disposition; and the obstinacy of some misers, who endured the most cruel torments before they would discover the secret object of their affection, was fatal to many unhappy wretches, who expired under the lash, for refusing to reveal their imaginary treasures. The edifices of Rome, though the damage has been much exaggerated, received some injury from the violence of the Goths. At their entrance through the Salarian gate, they fired the adjacent houses to guide their march, and to distract the attention of the citizens: the flames, which encountered no obstacle in the disorder of the night, consumed many private and public buildings; and the ruins of the palace of Sallust[3] remained, in the age of Justinian,

[1] Soz. l. ix. c. 10. Aug. (de Civ. Dei, l. i. c. 17.) intimates, that some virgins or matrons actually killed themselves to escape violation. The twenty maidens (if they ever existed), who threw themselves into the Elbe, when Magdeburgh was taken by storm, have been multiplied to the number of twelve hundred. Harte's Hist. of Gustavus Adolphus, i. 308.

[2] Marcella, a Roman lady, equally respectable for her rank, her age, and her piety, was thrown on the ground, and cruelly beaten and whipped, cæsum fustibus flagellisque, &c. Jerom. i. 121. ad Principiam. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. i. c. 10. The modern Sac. di Roma, p. 208. gives an idea of the various methods of torturing prisoners for gold.

[3] The historian Sallust, who usefully practised the vices which he has so eloquently censured,

a stately monument of the Gothic conflagration.[1] Yet a contemporary historian has observed, that fire could scarcely consume the enormous beams of solid brass, and that the strength of man was insufficient to subvert the foundations of ancient structures. Some truth may possibly be concealed in his devout assertion, that the wrath of Heaven supplied the imperfections of hostile rage; and that the proud Forum of Rome, decorated with the statues of so many gods and heroes, was levelled in the dust by the stroke of lightning.[2]

Whatever might be the numbers, of equestrian or plebeian rank, who perished in the massacre of Rome, it is confidently affirmed, that only one senator lost his life by the sword of the enemy.[3] But it was not easy to compute the multitudes, who, from an honourable station, and a prosperous fortune, were suddenly reduced to the miserable condition of captives and exiles. As the Barbarians had more occasion for money than for slaves, they fixed, at a moderate price, the redemption of their indigent prisoners; and the ransom was often paid by the benevolence of their friends, or the charity of strangers.[4] The captives, who were regularly sold, either in open market, or by private contract, would have legally regained their native freedom, which it was impossible for a citizen to lose, or to alienate.—*Heineccius*, *Antiq. Juris Roman.* i. 96. But as it was soon discovered, that the vindication of their liberty would endanger their lives; and that the Goths, unless they were tempted to sell, might be provoked to murder, their useless prisoners; the civil jurisprudence had been already qualified by a wise regulation, that they should be obliged to serve the moderate term of five years, till they had discharged by their labour the price of their redemption.[5] The nations who invaded the Roman empire, had driven before them, into Italy, whole troops of hungry and affrighted provincials, less apprehensive of servitude than of famine. The calamities of Rome and Italy dispersed the inhabitants to the most lonely, the most secure, the most distant places of refuge. While the

employed the plunder of Numidia to adorn his palace and gardens on the Quirinal hill. The spot where the house stood, is now marked by the church of St. Susanna, separated only by a street from the baths of Diocletian, and not far distant from the Salarian gate. Nardini, Roma Antica, p. 192. and the great Plan of Modern Rome, by Nolli.

[1] The expressions of Procopius are distinct and moderate (de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 2.). The Chronicle of Marcellinus speaks too strongly, partem urbis Romæ cremavit; and the words of Philostorgius (εν ερειπιοις δε της πολεως κειμενης, l. xii. c. 3.) convey a false and exaggerated idea. Bargæus has composed a particular dissertation (iv. Antiq. Rom. Græv.) to prove that the edifices of Rome were not subverted by the Goths and Vandals.

[2] Oros. l. ii. c. 19. p. 143. He speaks as if he disapproved *all* statues; vel Deum vel hominem mentiuntur. They consisted of the kings of Alba and Rome from Æneas, the Romans, illustrious either in arms or arts, and the deified Cæsars. The expression which he uses of *Forum* is somewhat ambiguous, since there existed *five* principal *Fora*; but as they were all contiguous and adjacent, in the plain which is surrounded by the Capitoline, the Quirinal, the Esquiline, and the Palatine hills, they might fairly be considered as *one*. Roma Antiqua of Donatus, p. 162. and Roma Antica of Nardini, p. 212. The former is more useful for the ancient descriptions, the latter for the actual topography.

[3] Oros. (l. ii. c. 19. p. 142.) compares the cruelty of the Gauls and the clemency of the Goths. Ibi vix quemquam inventum senatorem, qui vel absens evaserit; hic vix quemquam requiri, qui forte ut latens perierit. But there is an air of rhetoric, and perhaps of falsehood, in this antithesis; and Socr. (l. vii. c. 10.) affirms, perhaps by an opposite exaggeration, that *many* senators were put to death with various and exquisite tortures.

[4] Multi . . . Christiani in captivitatem ducti sunt. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. i. c. 14; and the Christians experienced no peculiar hardships.

[5] Append. Cod. Theod. xvi. in Sirmond. Opera, i. 735. This edict was published 11th Dec. A.D 408. and is more reasonable than properly belonged to the ministers of Honorius.

Gothic cavalry spread terror and desolation along the sea-coast of Campania and Tuscany, the little island of Igilium, separated by a narrow channel from the Argentarian promontory, repulsed, or eluded, their hostile attempts; and at so small a distance from Rome, great numbers of citizens were securely concealed in the thick woods of that sequestered spot.[1] The ample patrimonies, which many senatorian families possessed in Africa, invited them, if they had time, and prudence, to escape from the ruin of their country; to embrace the shelter of that hospitable province. The most illustrious of these fugitives was the noble and pious Proba,[2] the widow of the Præfect Petronius. After the death of her husband, the most powerful subject of Rome, she had remained at the head of the Anician family, and successively supplied, from her private fortune, the expence of the consulships of her three sons. When the city was besieged and taken by the Goths, Proba supported, with Christian resignation, the loss of immense riches; embarked in a small vessel, from whence she beheld, at sea, the flames of her burning palace, and fled with her daughter Læta, and her grand-daughter, the celebrated virgin, Demetrias, to the coast of Africa. The benevolent profusion with which the matron distributed the fruits, or the price, of her estates, contributed to alleviate the misfortunes of exile and captivity. But even the family of Proba herself was not exempt from the rapacious oppression of Count Heraclian, who basely sold the noblest maidens of Rome to the Syrian merchants. The Italian fugitives were dispersed through the provinces, along the coast of Egypt and Asia, as far as Constantinople and Jerusalem; and the village of Bethlem, the solitary residence of St. Jerom and his female converts, was crowded with illustrious beggars of either sex, and every age, who excited the public compassion by the remembrance of their past fortune.[3] This awful catastrophe of Rome filled the astonished empire with grief and terror. So interesting a contrast of greatness and ruin, disposed the fond credulity of the people to deplore, and even to exaggerate, the afflictions of the queen of cities. The clergy, who applied to recent events the lofty metaphors

[1] Eminus Igilii sylvosa cacumina miror;
Quem fraudare nefas laudis honore suæ
Hæc proprios nuper tutata est insula saltus;
Sive loci ingenio, seu Domini genio.
Gurgite cum modico victricibus obstitit armis
Tanquam longinquo dissociata mari.
Hæc multos lacerâ suscepit ab urbe fugatos,
Hic fessis posito certa timore salus.
Plurima terreno populaverat æquora bello,
Contra naturam classe timendus eques
Unum, mira fides, vario discrimine portum:
Tam prope Romanis, tam procul esse Getis.
Rutilius, in Itiner. l. i. 325.

The island is now called Giglio. Cluver. Ital. Antiq. l. ii. 502.

[2] As the adventures of Proba and her family are connected with the life of St. Augustin, they are diligently illustrated by Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xiii. 620. Some time after their arrival in Africa, Demetrias took the veil, and made a vow of virginity; an event which was considered as of the highest importance to Rome and to the world. All the *Saints* wrote congratulatory letters to her; that of Jerom is still extant (i. 62. ad Demetriad. de servandâ Virginitat.), and contains a mixture of absurd reasoning, spirited declamation, and curious facts, some of which relate to the siege and sack of Rome.

[3] See the pathetic complaint of Jerom (v. 400.), in his preface to Book ii. of his Comment. on Ezekiel.

of Oriental prophecy, were sometimes tempted to confound the destruction of the capital and the dissolution of the globe.

There exists in human nature a strong propensity to depreciate the advantages, and to magnify the evils, of the present times. Yet, when the first emotions had subsided, and a fair estimate was made of the real damage, the more learned and judicious contemporaries were forced to confess, that infant Rome had formerly received more essential injury from the Gauls, than she had now sustained from the Goths in her declining age.[1] The experience of eleven centuries has enabled posterity to produce a much more singular parallel; and to affirm with confidence, that the ravages of the Barbarians, whom Alaric had led from the banks of the Danube, were less destructive, than the hostilities exercised by the troops of Charles the Fifth, a Catholic prince, who styled himself Emperor of the Romans.[2] The Goths evacuated the city at the end of six days, but Rome remained above nine months in the possession of the Imperialists; and every hour was stained by some atrocious act of cruelty, lust, and rapine. The authority of Alaric preserved some order and moderation among the ferocious multitude, which acknowledged him for their leader and king: but the constable of Bourbon had gloriously fallen in the attack of the walls; and the death of the general removed every restraint of discipline, from an army which consisted of three independent nations, the Italians, the Spaniards, and the Germans. In the beginning of the sixteenth century, the manners of Italy exhibited a remarkable scene of the depravity of mankind. They united the sanguinary crimes that prevail in an unsettled state of society, with the polished vices that spring from the abuse of art and luxury: and the loose adventurers, who had violated every prejudice of patriotism and superstition to assault the palace of the Roman pontiff, must deserve to be considered as the most profligate of the *Italians*. At the same æra, the *Spaniards* were the terror both of the Old and New World: but their high-spirited valour was disgraced by gloomy pride, rapacious avarice, and unrelenting cruelty. Indefatigable in the pursuit of fame and riches, they had improved, by repeated practice, the most exquisite and effectual methods of torturing their prisoners; many of the Castillians, who pillaged Rome, were familiars of the holy inquisition; and some volunteers, perhaps, were lately returned from the conquest of Mexico. The *Germans* were less corrupt than the Italians, less cruel than the Spaniards; and the rustic, or even savage, aspect of those *Tramontane* warriors, often disguised a simple and merciful disposition. But they had imbibed, in the first fervour of the reformation, the spirit, as well as the principles, of Luther. It was their favourite amusement to in-

[1] Orosius, though with some theological partiality, states this comparison, l. ii. c. 19. p. 142. l. vii. c. 39. p. 575. But, in the history of the taking of Rome by the Gauls, everything is uncertain, and perhaps fabulous. Beaufort sur l'Incertit. &c. de l'Hist. Romaine, p. 356; and Melot, in the Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscript. xv. 1—21.

[2] The reader who wishes to inform himself of the circumstances of this famous event, may peruse an admirable narrative in Robertson's Hist. of Charles V. ii. 283.; or consult the Annali d'Italia of the learned Muratori, xiv. 230. If he is desirous of examining the originals, he may have recourse to the eighteenth book of the great, but unfinished, history of Guicciardini. But the account which most truly deserves the name of authentic and original, is a little book, intitled, *Il Sacco di Roma*, composed, within less than a month after the assault of the city, by the *brother* of the historian Guicciardini, who appears to have been an able magistrate, and a dispassionate writer.

sult, or destroy, the consecrated objects of Catholic superstition; they indulged, without pity, or remorse, a devout hatred against the clergy of every denomination and degree, who form so considerable a part of the inhabitants of modern Rome; and their fanatic zeal might aspire to subvert the throne of Antichrist, to purify, with blood and fire, the abominations of the spiritual Babylon.[1]

The retreat of the victorious Goths, who evacuated Rome on the sixth day[2] (A.D. 410. Aug. 29), might be the result of prudence; but it was not surely the effect of fear.[3] At the head of an army, encumbered with rich and weighty spoils, their intrepid leader advanced along the Appian way into the southern provinces of Italy, destroying whatever dared to oppose his passage, and contenting himself with the plunder of the unresisting country. The fate of Capua, the proud and luxurious metropolis of Campania, and which was respected, even in its decay, as the eighth city of the empire,[4] is buried in oblivion; whilst the adjacent town of Nola[5] has been illustrated, on this occasion, by the sanctity of Paulinus,[6] who was successively a consul, a monk, and a bishop. At the age of forty, he renounced the enjoyment of wealth and honour, of society and literature, to embrace a life of solitude and penance; and the loud applause of the clergy encouraged him to despise the reproaches of his worldly friends, who ascribed this desperate act to some disorder of the mind or body.[7] An early and passionate attachment determined him to fix his humble dwelling in one of the suburbs of Nola, near the miraculous tomb of St. Fælix, which the public devotion had already surrounded with five large and populous churches. The remains of his fortune, and of his understanding, were dedicated to the service of the glorious martyr; whose praise, on the day of his festival, Paulinus never failed to celebrate by a solemn hymn; and in whose name he erected a sixth church, of superior elegance and beauty, which was decorated with many curious pictures, from the History of the Old and New Testament. Such assiduous zeal secured the favour of the saint,[8] or at least of the people; and, after fifteen years' retirement, the Roman consul was compelled to accept the bishopric of Nola, a few months before the city was in-

[1] The furious spirit of Luther, the effect of temper and enthusiasm, has been forcibly attacked (Bossuet, Hist. des Variat. des Eglis. Protest. i. 20.), and feebly defended (Seckendorf, Comment. de Lutheranismo, especially l. i. No. 78. p. 120. and l. iii. No. 122. p. 556.).

[2] Marcellinus, in Chron. Oros. (l. vii. c. 39. p. 575.) asserts, that he left Rome on the *third* day; but this difference is easily reconciled by the successive motions of great bodies of troops.

[3] Socr. (l. vii. c. 10.) pretends, without any colour of truth, or reason, that Alaric fled on the report, that the armies of the Eastern empire were in full march to attack him.

[4] Ausonius de Claris Urbibus, p. 233. ed. Toll. The luxury of Capua had formerly surpassed that of Sybaris itself. Athenæus Deipnosophist. l. xii. 528. ed. Casaubon.

[5] Forty-eight years before the foundation of Rome (about 800 before the Christian æra), the Tuscans built Capua and Nola, at the distance of 23 miles from each other: but the latter of the two cities never emerged from a state of mediocrity.

[6] Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. xiv. 1—146.) has compiled, with his usual diligence, all that relates to the life and writings of Paulinus, whose retreat is celebrated by his own pen, and by the praises of St. Ambrose, St. Jerom, St. Augustin, Sulpicius Severus, &c. his Christian friends and contemporaries.

[7] See the affectionate letters of Auson. (epist. xix—xxv. 650. ed. Toll.), to his colleague, his friend, and his disciple Paulinus. The religion of Ausonius is still a problem (Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. xv. 123.). I believe that it was such in his own time, and, consequently, that in his heart he was a Pagan.

[8] The humble Paulinus once presumed to say, that he believed St. Fælix *did* love him; at least, as a master loves his little dog.

vested by the Goths. During the siege, some religious persons were satisfied that they had seen, either in dreams or visions, the divine form of their tutelar patron; yet it soon appeared by the event, that Fælix wanted power, or inclination, to preserve the flock, of which he had formerly been the shepherd. Nola was not saved from the general devastation;[1] and the captive bishop was protected only by the general opinion of his innocence and poverty. Above four years (A.D. 408—412) elapsed from the successful invasion of Italy by the arms of Alaric, to the voluntary retreat of the Goths under the conduct of his successor Adolphus; and, during the whole time, they reigned without control over a country, which, in the opinion of the ancients, had united all the various excellencies of nature and art. The prosperity, indeed, which Italy had attained in the auspicious age of the Antonines, had gradually declined with the decline of the empire. The fruits of a long peace perished under the rude grasp of the Barbarians; and they themselves were incapable of tasting the more elegant refinements of luxury, which had been prepared for the use of the soft and polished Italians. Each soldier, however, claimed an ample portion of the substantial plenty, the corn and cattle, oil and wine, that was daily collected, and consumed, in the Gothic camp; and the principal warriors insulted the villas and gardens, once inhabited by Lucullus and Cicero, along the beauteous coast of Campania. Their trembling captives, the sons and daughters of Roman senators, presented, in goblets of gold and gems, large draughts of Falernian wine, to the haughty victors; who stretched their huge limbs under the shade of plane trees,[2] artificially disposed to exclude the scorching rays, and to admit the genial warmth, of the sun. These delights were enhanced by the memory of past hardships: the comparison of their native soil, the bleak and barren hills of Scythia, and the frozen banks of the Elbe and Danube, added new charms to the felicity of the Italian climate.[3]

Whether fame, or conquest, or riches, were the object of Alaric, he pursued that object with an indefatigable ardour, which could neither be quelled by adversity, nor satiated by success. No sooner had he reached the extreme land of Italy, than he was attracted by the neighbouring prospect of a fertile and peaceful island. Yet even the possession of Sicily, he considered only as an intermediate step to the important expedition, which he already meditated against the contin-

[1] Jornan. de Reb. Get. c. 30. p. 653. Philostorg. l. xii. c. 3. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. i. c. 10. Baronius, Annal. Eccles. A.D. 410. No. 45, 46.

[2] The *platanus*, or plane-tree, was a favourite of the ancients, by whom it was propagated, for the sake of shade, from the East to Gaul. Pliny, Hist. Natur. xii. 3, 4, 5. He mentions several of an enormous size; one in the Imperial villa at Velitræ, which Caligula called his nest, as the branches were capable of holding a large table, the proper attendants, and the emperor himself, whom Pliny quaintly styles *pars umbræ*; an expression which might, with equal reason, be applied to Alaric.

[3] The prostrate South to the destroyer yields
Her boasted titles, and the golden fields:
With grim delight the brood of winter view
A brighter day, and skies of azure hue;
Scent the new fragrance of the opening rose,
And quaff the pendant vintage as it grows.

Gray's Poems. Instead of compiling tables of chronology and natural history, why did not Mr. Gray apply the powers of his genius to finish the philosophic poem, of which he has left such an exquisite specimen?

ent of Africa. The straits of Rhegium and Messina[1] are 12 miles in length, and, in the narrowest passage, about one mile and a half broad; and the fabulous monsters of the deep, the rocks of Scylla, and the whirlpool of Charybdis, could terrify none but the most timid and unskilful mariners. Yet as soon as the first division of the Goths had embarked, a sudden tempest arose, which sunk, or scattered, many of the transports; their courage was daunted by the terrors of a new element; and the whole design was defeated by the premature death of Alaric (A.D. 410), which fixed, after a short illness, the fatal term of his conquests. The ferocious character of the Barbarians was displayed, in the funeral of a hero, whose valour and fortune they celebrated with mournful applause. By the labour of a captive multitude, they forcibly diverted the course of the Busentinus, a small river that washes the walls of Consentia. The royal sepulchre, adorned with the splendid spoils and trophies of Rome, was constructed in the vacant bed; the waters were then restored to their natural channel; and the secret spot, where the remains of Alaric had been deposited, was for ever concealed by the inhuman massacre of the prisoners, who had been employed to execute the work.—*Jornandes de Rebus Get.* c. 30, p. 654.

The personal animosities, and hereditary feuds, of the Barbarians, were suspended by the strong necessity of their affairs; and the brave Adolphus, the brother-in-law of the deceased monarch, was (A.D. 412) unanimously elected to succeed to his throne. The character and political system of the new king of the Goths may be best understood from his own conversation with an illustrious citizen of Narbonne; who afterwards, in a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, related it to St. Jerom, in the presence of the historian Orosius. "In the full confid-"ence of valour and victory, I once aspired (said Adolphus) to change "the face of the universe; to obliterate the name of Rome; to erect "on its ruins the dominion of the Goths; and to acquire, like Augus-"tus, the immortal fame of the founder of a new empire. By repeated "experiments, I was gradually convinced, that laws are essentially "necessary to maintain and regulate a well-constituted state; and that "the fierce untractable humour of the Goths was incapable of bearing "the salutary yoke of laws, and civil government. From that mo-"ment I proposed to myself a different object of glory and ambition; "and it is now my sincere wish, that the gratitude of future ages "should acknowledge the merit of a stranger, who employed the "sword of the Goths, not to subvert, but to restore and maintain, the "prosperity of the Roman empire."[2] With these pacific views, the successor of Alaric suspended the operations of war; and seriously negociated with the Imperial court a treaty of friendship and alliance. It was the interest of the ministers of Honorius, who were now released from the obligation of their extravagant oath, to deliver Italy from the intolerable weight of the Gothic powers; and they readily

[1] For the perfect description of the Straits of Messina, Scylla, Charybdis, &c. see Cluver. (Ital. Antiq. l. iv. 1293. and Sicilia Antiq. l. i. 60.), who had diligently studied the ancients, and surveyed with a curious eye the actual face of the country.

[2] Oros. l. vii. c. 43. p. 584. He was sent by St. Augustin, in the year 415, from Africa to Palestine, to visit St. Jerom, and to consult with him on the subject of the Pelagian controversy.

accepted their service against the tyrants and Barbarians, who infested the provinces beyond the Alps.[1] Adolphus, assuming the character of a Roman general, directed his march from the extremity of Campania to the southern provinces of Gaul. His troops, either by force or agreement, immediately occupied the cities of Narbonne, Thoulouse, and Bourdeaux; and though they were repulsed by Count Boniface from the walls of Marseilles, they soon extended their quarters from the Mediterranean to the Ocean. The oppressed provincials might exclaim, that the miserable remnant, which the enemy had spared, was cruelly ravished by their pretended allies; yet some specious colours were not wanting to palliate, or justify, the violence of the Goths. The cities of Gaul, which they attacked, might perhaps be considered as in a state of rebellion against the government of Honorius: the articles of the treaty, or the secret instructions of the court, might sometimes be alleged in favour of the seeming usurpations of Adolphus; and the guilt of any irregular, unsuccessful act of hostility, might always be imputed, with an appearance of truth, to the ungovernable spirit of a Barbarian host, impatient of peace or discipline. The luxury of Italy had been less effectual to soften the temper, than to relax the courage, of the Goths; and they had imbibed the vices, without imitating the arts and institutions, of civilized society.[2]

The professions of Adolphus were probably sincere, and his attachment to the cause of the republic was secured (A.D. 414) by the ascendant which a Roman princess had acquired over the heart and understanding of the Barbarian king. Placidia,[3] the daughter of the great Theodosius, and of Galla, his second wife, had received a royal education in the palace of Constantinople; but the eventful story of her life is connected with the revolutions which agitated the Western empire under the reign of her brother Honorius. When Rome was first invested by the arms of Alaric, Placidia, who was then about twenty years of age, resided in the city; and her ready consent to the death of her cousin Serena, has a cruel and ungrateful appearance, which, according to the circumstances of the action, may be aggravated, or excused, by the consideration of her tender age.—*Zosim.* l. v. 350. The victorious Barbarians detained, either as a hostage or a captive,[4] the sister of Honorius; but, while she was exposed to the disgrace of following round Italy the motions of a Gothic camp, she experienced, however, a decent and respectful treatment. The authority of Jornandes, who praises the beauty of Placidia, may perhaps be counterbalanced by the silence, the expressive silence, of her

[1] Jornandes supposes, without much probability, that Adolphus visited and plundered Rome a second time (more locustarum erasit). Yet he agrees with Orosius in supposing, that a treaty of peace was concluded between the Gothic prince and Honorius. Oros. l. vii. c. 43. p. 584. Jornan. de Reb. Geticis, c. 31. p. 654.

[2] The retreat of the Goths from Italy, and their first transactions in Gaul, are dark and doubtful. I have derived much assistance from Mascou (Hist. of the ancient Germans, l. viii. c. 29. 35, 36, 37.), who has illustrated, and connected, the broken chronicles and fragments of the times.

[3] See Placidia in Ducange, Fam. Byzant. p. 72.; and Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 260. 386, &c. vi. 240.

[4] Zosim. l. vi. 383. Oros. (l. vii. c. 40. p. 576.) and the Chronicles of Marcellinus and Idatius seem to suppose, that the Goths did not carry away Placidia till after the last siege of Rome.

flatterers: yet the splendour of her birth, the bloom of youth, the elegance of manners, and the dexterous insinuation which she condescended to employ, made a deep impression on the mind of Adolphus; and the Gothic king aspired to call himself the brother of the emperor. The ministers of Honorius rejected with disdain the proposal of an alliance, so injurious to every sentiment of Roman pride; and repeatedly urged the restitution of Placidia, as an indispensable condition of the treaty of peace. But the daughter of Theodosius submitted, without reluctance, to the desires of the conqueror, a young and valiant prince, who yielded to Alaric in loftiness of stature, but who excelled in the more attractive qualities of grace and beauty. The marriage of Adolphus and Placidia[1] was consummated before the Goths retired from Italy; and the solemn, perhaps the anniversary, day, of their nuptials was afterwards celebrated in the house of Ingenuus, one of the most illustrious citizens of Narbonne in Gaul. The bride, attired and adorned like a Roman empress, was placed on a throne of state; and the king of the Goths, who assumed, on this occasion, the Roman habit, contented himself with a less honourable seat by her side. The nuptial gift, which, according to the custom of his nation,[2] was offered to Placidia, consisted of the rare and magnificent spoils of her country. Fifty beautiful youths, in silken robes, carried a bason in each hand; and one of these basons was filled with pieces of gold, the other with precious stones of an inestimable value. Attalus, so long the sport of fortune, and of the Goths, was appointed to lead the chorus of the Hymenæal song; and the degraded emperor might aspire to the praise of a skilful musician. The Barbarians enjoyed the insolence of their triumph; and the provincials rejoiced in this alliance, which tempered, by the mild influence of love and reason, the fierce spirit of their Gothic lord.[3]

The hundred basons of gold and gems, presented to Placidia at her nuptial feast, formed an inconsiderable portion of the Gothic treasures; of which some extraordinary specimens may be selected from the history of the successors of Adolphus. Many curious and costly ornaments of pure gold, enriched with jewels, were found in their palace of Narbonne, when it was pillaged, in the sixth century, by the Franks: sixty cups, or chalices; fifteen *patens*, or plates, for the use of the communion; twenty boxes, or cases, to hold the books of the gospels;

[1] See the pictures of Adolphus and Placidia, and the account of their marriage in Jornan. de Reb. Get. c. 31. p. 654. With regard to the place where the nuptials were celebrated, the MSS. of Jornandes vary between two neighbouring cities, Forli and Imola (Forum Livii and Forum Cornelii). It is fair and easy to reconcile the Gothic historian with Olympiodorus (Mascou, l. viii. c. 46.): but Tillemont grows peevish, and swears, that it is not worth while to try to conciliate Jornandes with any good authors.

[2] The Visigoths (the subjects of Adolphus) restrained, by subsequent laws, the prodigality of conjugal love. It was illegal for a husband to make any gift or settlement for the benefit of his wife during the first year of their marriage; and his liberality could not at any time exceed the tenth part of his property. The Lombards were somewhat more indulgent: they allowed the *morgingcap* immediately after the wedding-night; and this famous gift might equal the fourth part of the husband's substance. Some cautious maidens, indeed, were wise enough to stipulate before-hand a present, which they were too sure of not deserving. Montesquieu, Esprit des Loix, l. xix. c. 25. Muratori, delle Antichità Italiane, i. Dissertaz. xx. 243.

[3] We owe the curious detail of this nuptial feast to the historian Olympiodorus apud Phot. p. 185.

this consecrated wealth[1] was distributed by the son of Clovis among the churches of his dominions, and his pious liberality seems to upbraid some former sacrilege of the Goths. They possessed, with more security of conscience, the famous *missorium*, or great dish for the service of the table, of massy gold, of the weight of five hundred pounds, and of far superior value, from the precious stones, the exquisite workmanship, and the tradition, that it had been presented by Ætius the patrician, to Torismond king of the Goths. One of the successors of Torismond purchased the aid of the French monarch by the promise of this magnificent gift. When he was seated on the throne of Spain, he delivered it with reluctance to the ambassadors of Dagobert; despoiled them on the road; stipulated, after a long negociation, the inadequate ransom of 200,000 pieces of gold; and preserved the *missorium*, as the pride of the Gothic treasury.[2] When that treasury, after the conquest of Spain, was plundered by the Arabs, they admired, and they have celebrated, another object still more remarkable; a table of considerable size, of one single piece of solid emerald,[3] encircled with three rows of fine pearls, supported by 365 feet of gems and massy gold, and estimated at the price of 500,000 pieces of gold.[4] Some portion of the Gothic treasures might be the gift of friendship, or the tribute of obedience: but the far greater part had been the fruits of war and rapine, the spoils of the empire, and perhaps of Rome.

After the deliverance of Italy from the oppression of the Goths, some secret counsellor was (A.D. 410—417) permitted, amidst the factions of the palace, to heal the wounds of that afflicted country.[5] By a wise and humane regulation, the eight provinces which had been the most deeply injured, Campania, Tuscany, Picenum, Samnium, Apulia, Calabria, Bruttium, and Lucania, obtained an indulgence of five years: the ordinary tribute was reduced to one fifth, and even that fifth was destined to restore, and support, the useful institution of the public posts. By another law, the lands, which had been left without inhabitants or cultivation, were granted, with some diminution of taxes, to the neighbours who should occupy, or the strangers who

[1] See in the great collection of the historians of France by Dom. Bouquet, ii. Greg. Turon. l. iii. c. 10. p. 191. Gesta Regum Francor. c. 23. p. 557. The anonymous writer, with an ignorance worthy of his times, supposes that these instruments of Christian worship had belonged to the temple of Solomon. If he has any meaning, it must be, that they were found in the sack of Rome.

[2] Consult the following original testimonies in the Historians of France, ii. Fredegarii Scholastici Chron. c. 73. p. 441. Fredegar. Fragment. iii. p. 463. Gesta Regis Dagobert. c. 29. p. 587. The accession of Sisenand to the throne of Spain happened A.D. 631. The 200,000 pieces of gold were appropriated by Dagobert to the foundation of the church of St. Denys.

[3] Goguet (Orig. des Loix, &c. ii. 239.) is of opinion, that the stupendous pieces of emerald, the statues and columns, which antiquity has placed in Egypt, at Gades, at Constantinople, were in reality artificial compositions of coloured glass. The famous emerald dish, which is shown at Genoa, is supposed to countenance the suspicion.

[4] Elmacin. Hist. Saracenica, l. i. 85. Roderic. Tolet. Hist. Arab. c. 9. Cardonne, Hist. de l'Afrique et de l'Epag. sous les Arabes, i. 83. It was called the table of Solomon, according to the custom of the Orientals, who ascribe to that prince every ancient work of knowledge or magnificence.

[5] His three laws are inserted in the Theod. Code, l. xi. tit. xxviii. leg. 7. L. xiii. tit. xi. leg. 12. L. xv. tit. xiv. leg. 14. The expressions of the last are very remarkable; since they contain not only a pardon, but an apology.

should solicit them; and the new possessors were secured against the future claims of the fugitive proprietors. About the same time a general amnesty was published in the name of Honorius, to abolish the guilt and memory of all the *involuntary* offences, which had been committed by his unhappy subjects, during the term of the public disorder and calamity. A decent and respectful attention was paid to the restoration of the capital; the citizens were encouraged to rebuild the edifices which had been destroyed or damaged by hostile fire; and extraordinary supplies of corn were imported from the coast of Africa. The crowds that so lately fled before the sword of the Barbarians, were soon recalled by the hopes of plenty and pleasure; and Albinus, præfect of Rome, informed the court, with some anxiety and surprise, that, in a single day, he had taken an account of the arrival of 14,000 strangers.[1] In less than seven years, the vestiges of the Gothic invasion were almost obliterated; and the city appeared to resume its former splendour and tranquillity. The venerable matron replaced her crown of laurel, which had been ruffled by the storms of war; and was still amused, in the last moment of her decay, with the prophecies of revenge, of victory, and of eternal dominion.[2]

This apparent tranquillity was soon disturbed by the approach of an hostile armament from the country which afforded the daily subsistence of the Roman people. Heraclian, count of Africa, who, under the most difficult and distressful circumstances, had supported, with active loyalty, the cause of Honorius, was tempted, in the year (A.D. 413) of his consulship, to assume the character of a rebel, and the title of emperor. The ports of Africa were immediately filled with the naval forces, at the head of which he prepared to invade Italy: and his fleet, when it cast anchor at the mouth of the Tyber, indeed surpassed the fleets of Xerxes and Alexander, if *all* the vessels, including the royal galley, and the smallest boat, did actually amount to the incredible number of three thousand two hundred.[3] Yet with such an armament, which might have subverted, or restored, the greatest empires of the earth, the African usurper made a very faint and feeble impression on the provinces of his rival. As he marched from the port, along the road which leads to the gates of Rome, he was encountered, terrified and routed, by one of the Imperial captains; and the lord of this mighty host, deserting his fortune and his friends, ignominiously fled with a single ship.[4] When Heraclian landed in the harbour of

[1] Olympiod. ap. Phot. p. 188. Philostorg. (l. xii. c. 5.) observes, that when Honorius made his triumphal entry, he encouraged the Romans, with his hand and voice (χειρι και γλωττῃ), to rebuild their city; and the Chronicle of Prosper commends Heraclian, qui in Romanæ urbis reparationem strenuum exibuerat ministerium.

[2] The date of the voyage of Claudius Rutilius Numatianus, is clogged with some difficulties; but Scaliger has deduced from astronomical characters, that he left Rome Sept. 24, and embarked at Porto Oct. 9, A.D. 416. Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 820. In this poetical Itinerary, Rutilius (l. i. 115.) addresses Rome in a high strain of congratulation:

Erige crinales lauros, seniumque sacrati Verticis in virides Roma recinge comas, &c.

[3] Orosius composed his history in Africa, only two years after the event; yet his authority seems to be overbalanced by the improbability of the fact. The Chronicle of Marcellinus gives Heraclian 700 ships, and 3000 men; the latter of these numbers is ridiculously corrupt: but the former would please me very much.

[4] The Chronicle of Idatius affirms, without the least appearance of truth, that he advanced as far as Otriculum, in Umbria, where he was overthrown in a great battle, with the loss of 50,000 men.

Carthage, he found that the whole province, disdaining such an unworthy ruler, had returned to their allegiance. The rebel was beheaded in the ancient temple of Memory; his consulship was abolished;[1] and the remains of his private fortune, not exceeding the moderate sum of 4000 pounds of gold, were granted to the brave Constantius, who had already defended the throne, which he afterwards shared with his feeble sovereign. Honorius viewed, with supine indifference, the calamities of Rome and Italy;[2] but the rebellious at tempts of Attalus and Heraclian, against his personal safety, awakened, for a moment, the torpid instinct of his nature. He was probably ignorant of the causes and events which preserved him from these impending dangers; and as Italy was no longer invaded by any foreign or domestic enemies, he peaceably existed in the palace of Ravenna, while the tyrants beyond the Alps were repeatedly vanquished in the name, and by the lieutenants, of the son of Theodosius.[3] In the course of a busy and interesting narrative, I might possibly forget to mention the death of such a prince: and I shall therefore take the precaution of observing, in this place, that he survived the last siege of Rome about thirteen years.

The usurpation of Constantine, who received the purple from the legions of Britain, had been successful; and seemed to be secure. His title was acknowledged, from the wall of Antoninus to the columns of Hercules; and, in the midst of the public disorder, he shared the dominion, and the plunder, of Gaul and Spain (A.D. 409—413), with the tribes of Barbarians, whose destructive progress was no longer checked by the Rhine or Pyrenees. Stained with the blood of the kinsmen of Honorius, he extorted, from the court of Ravenna, with which he secretly corresponded, the ratification of his rebellious claims. Constantine engaged himself, by a solemn promise, to deliver Italy from the Goths; advanced as far as the banks of the Po; and after alarming, rather than assisting, his pusillanimous ally, hastily returned to the palace of Arles, to celebrate, with intemperate luxury, his vain and ostentatious triumph. But this transient prosperity was soon interrupted and destroyed by the revolt of count Gerontius, the bravest of his generals; who, during the absence of his son Constans, a prince already invested with the Imperial purple, had been left to command in the provinces of Spain. For some reason, of which we are ignorant, Gerontius, instead of assuming the diadem, placed it on the head of his friend Maximus, who fixed his residence at Tarragona, while the active count pressed forwards, through the Pyrenees, to surprise the two emperors, Constantine and Constans, before they could prepare for their defence. The son was made prisoner at Vienna, and

[1] Cod. Theod. l. xv. tit. xiv. leg. 13. The legal acts performed in his name, even the manumission of slaves, were declared invalid, till they had been formally repeated.

[2] I have disdained to mention a very foolish, and probably a false, report (Procop. de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 2.), that Honorius was alarmed by the *loss* of Rome, till he understood that it was not a favourite chicken of that name, but *only* the capital of the world, which had been lost. Yet even this story is some evidence of the public opinion.

[3] The materials for the lives of all these tyrants are taken from six contemporary historians, two Latins and four Greeks: Oros. l. vii. c. 42. p. 581.; Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus, apud Gregor. Turon. l. ii. c, 9. in the historians of France, ii. 165. Zos. l. vi. 370. Olympiod. apud Phot. p. 180. Soz. l. ix. c. 12, 13, 14, 15.; and Philostorg. l. xii. c. 5, 6., with Godefroy's Dissert. p. 477.; besides the four Chronicles of Prosper Tyro, Prosper of Aquitain Idatius, and Marcellinus.

immediately put to death; and the unfortunate youth had scarcely leisure to deplore the elevation of his family; which had tempted, or compelled him, sacrilegiously to desert the peaceful obscurity of the monastic life. The father maintained a siege within the walls of Arles; but those walls must have yielded to the assailants, had not the city been unexpectedly relieved by the approach of an Italian army. The name of Honorius, the proclamation of a lawful emperor, astonished the contending parties of the rebels. Gerontius, abandoned by his own troops, escaped to the confines of Spain; and rescued his name from oblivion, by the Roman courage which appeared to animate the last moments of his life. In the middle of the night, a great body of his perfidious soldiers surrounded, and attacked his house, which he had strongly barricaded. His wife, a valiant friend of the nation of the Alani, and some faithful slaves, were still attached to his person; and he used, with so much skill and resolution, a large magazine of darts and arrows, that above 300 of the assailants lost their lives in the attempt. His slaves, when all the missile weapons were spent, fled at the dawn of day; and Gerontius, if he had not been restrained by conjugal tenderness, might have imitated their example; till the soldiers, provoked by such obstinate resistance, applied fire on all sides to the house. In this fatal extremity, he complied with the request of his Barbarian friend, and cut off his head. The wife of Gerontius, who conjured him not to abandon her to a life of misery and disgrace, eagerly presented her neck to his sword; and the tragic scene was terminated by the death of the count himself, who, after three ineffectual strokes, drew a short dagger, and sheathed it in his heart.[1] The unprotected Maximus, whom he had invested with the purple, was indebted for his life to the contempt that was entertained of his power and abilities. The caprice of the Barbarians, who ravaged Spain, once more seated this Imperial phantom on the throne: but they soon resigned him to the justice of Honorius; and the tyrant Maximus, after he had been shown to the people of Ravenna and Rome, was publicly executed.

The general, Constantius was his name, who raised by his approach the siege of Arles, and dissipated the troops of Gerontius, was born a Roman: and this remarkable distinction is strongly expressive of the decay of military spirit among the subjects of the empire. The strength and majesty which were conspicuous in the person of that general,[2] marked him, in the popular opinion, as a candidate worthy of the throne, which he afterwards ascended. In the familiar intercourse of private life, his manners were cheerful and engaging: nor would he sometimes disdain, in the licence of convivial mirth, to vie with the pantomimes themselves, in the exercises of their ridiculous profession. But when the trumpet summoned him to arms; when he

[1] The praises which Sozomen has bestowed on this act of despair, appear strange and scandalous in the mouth of an ecclesiastical historian. He observes (p. 379.), that the wife of Gerontius was a *Christian;* and that her death was worthy of her religion, and of immortal fame.

[2] Ειδος αξιον τυραννιδος, is the expression of Olympiodorus, which he seems to have borrowed from *Æolus*, a tragedy of Euripides, of which some fragments only are now extant (Euripid. Barnes, ii. 443. ver. 38.). This allusion may prove, that the ancient tragic poets were still familiar to the Greeks of the fifth century.

mounted his horse, and, bending down (for such was his singular practice) almost upon the neck, fiercely rolled his large animated eyes round the field, Constantius then struck terror into his foes, and inspired his soldiers with the assurance of victory. He had received from the court of Ravenna the important commission of extirpating rebellion in the provinces of the West; and the pretended emperor Constantine, after enjoying a short and anxious respite, was again besieged in his capital by the arms of a more formidable enemy. Yet this interval allowed time for a successful negociation with the Franks and Alemanni; and his ambassador, Edobic, soon returned, at the head of an army, to disturb the operations of the siege of Arles. The Roman general, instead of expecting the attack in his lines, boldly, and perhaps wisely, resolved to pass the Rhone, and to meet the Barbarians. His measures were conducted with so much skill and secrecy, that, while they engaged the infantry of Constantius in the front, they were suddenly attacked, surrounded, and destroyed by the cavalry of his lieutenant Ulphilas, who had silently gained an advantageous post in their rear. The remains of the army of Edobic were preserved by flight or submission, and their leader escaped from the field of battle to the house of a faithless friend; who too clearly understood, that the head of his obnoxious guest would be an acceptable and lucrative present for the Imperial general. On this occasion, Constantius behaved with the magnanimity of a genuine Roman. Subduing, or suppressing, every sentiment of jealousy, he publicly acknowledged the merit and services of Ulphilas: but he turned with horror from the assassin of Edobic; and sternly intimated his commands, that the camp should no longer be polluted by the presence of an ungrateful wretch, who had violated the laws of friendship and hospitality. The usurper, who beheld, from the walls of Arles, the ruin of his last hopes, was tempted to place some confidence in so generous a conqueror. He required a solemn promise for his security; and after receiving, by the imposition of hands, the sacred character of a Christian Presbyter, he ventured to open the gates of the city. But he soon experienced, that the principles of honour and integrity, which might regulate the ordinary conduct of Constantius, were superseded by the loose doctrines of political morality. The Roman general, indeed, refused to sully his laurels with the blood of Constantine; but the abdicated emperor, and his son Julian, were (A.D. 411. Nov. 28) sent under a strong guard into Italy; and before they reached the palace of Ravenna, they met the ministers of death.

At a time (A.D. 411—416) when it was universally confessed, that almost every man in the empire was superior in personal merit to the princes whom the accident of their birth had seated on the throne, a rapid succession of usurpers, regardless of the fate of their predecessors, still continued to arise. This mischief was peculiarly felt in the provinces of Spain and Gaul, where the principles of order and obedience had been extinguished by war and rebellion. Before Constantine resigned the purple, and in the fourth month of the siege of Arles, intelligence was received in the Imperial camp, that Jovinus had assumed the diadem at Mentz, in the Upper Germany, at the instigation of Goar, king of the Alani, and of Guntiarius, king of the Bur

gundians; and that the candidate, on whom they had bestowed the empire, advanced, with a formidable host of Barbarians, from the banks of the Rhine to those of the Rhone. Every circumstance is dark and extraordinary in the short history of the reign of Jovinus. It was natural to expect, that a brave and skilful general, at the head of a victorious army, would have asserted, in a field of battle, the justice of the cause of Honorius. The hasty retreat of Constantius might be justified by weighty reasons; but he resigned, without a struggle, the possession of Gaul: and Dardanus, the Prætorian præfect, is recorded as the only magistrate, who refused to yield obedience to the usurper.[1] When the Goths, two years after the siege of Rome, established their quarters in Gaul, it was natural to suppose that their inclinations could be divided only between the emperor Honorius, with whom they had formed a recent alliance, and the degraded Attalus, whom they reserved in their camp for the occasional purpose of acting the part of a musician or a monarch. Yet in a moment of disgust (for which it is not easy to assign a cause, or a date), Adolphus connected himself with the usurper of Gaul; and imposed on Attalus the ignominious task of negociating the treaty, which ratified his own disgrace. We are again surprised to read, that, instead of considering the Gothic alliance as the firmest support of his throne, Jovinus upbraided, in dark and ambiguous language, the officious importunity of Attalus; that, scorning the advice of his great ally, he invested with the purple his brother Sebastian; and that he most imprudently accepted the service of Sarus, when that gallant chief, the soldier of Honorius, was provoked to desert the court of a prince, who knew not how to reward, or punish. Adolphus, educated among a race of warriors, who esteemed the duty of revenge as the most precious and sacred portion of their inheritance, advanced with a body of 10,000 Goths to encounter the hereditary enemy of the house of Balti. He attacked Sarus at an unguarded moment, when he was accompanied only by eighteen or twenty of his valiant followers. United by friendship, animated by despair, but at length oppressed by multitudes, this band of heroes deserved the esteem, without exciting the compassion, of their enemies; and the lion was no sooner taken in the toils,[2] than he was instantly dispatched. The death of Sarus dissolved the loose alliance which Adolphus still maintained with the usurpers of Gaul. He again listened to the dictates of love and prudence; and soon satisfied the brother of Placidia, by the assurance that he would immediately transmit, to the palace of Ravenna, the heads of the two tyrants, Jovinus and Sebastian. The king of the Goths executed his promise without difficulty or delay: the helpless brothers, unsupported by any personal merit, were aban-

[1] Sidon. Apollin. (l. v. epist. 9. p. 139. and Not. Sirmond. p. 58.), after stigmatizing the *inconstancy* of Constantine, the *facility* of Jovinus, the *perfidy* of Gerontius, continues to observe, that *all* the vices of these tyrants were united in the person of Dardanus. Yet the præfect supported a respectable character in the world, and even in the church; held a devout correspondence with St. Augustin and St. Jerom; and was complimented by the latter (iii. 66.) with the epithets of Christianorum Nobilissime, and Nobilium Christianissime.

[2] The expression may be understood almost literally; Olympiodor. says, μολις σακκοις εζωγρησαν. Σακκος (or σακος) may signify a sack, or a loose garment; and this method of entangling and catching an enemy, laciniis contortis, was much practised by the Huns (Ammian. xxxi. 2.). Il fut pris vif avec des filets, is the translation of Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 608.

doned by their barbarian auxiliaries; and the short opposition of Valentia was expiated by the ruin of one of the noblest cities of Gaul. The emperor, chosen by the Roman senate, who had been promoted, degraded, insulted, restored, again degraded, and again insulted, was finally abandoned to his fate: but when the Gothic king withdrew his protection, he was restrained, by pity or contempt, from offering any violence to the person of Attalus. The unfortunate Attalus, who was left without subjects or allies, embarked in one of the ports of Spain, in search of some secure and solitary retreat: but he was intercepted at sea, conducted to the presence of Honorius, led in triumph through the streets of Rome or Ravenna, and publicly exposed to the gazing multitude, on the second step of the throne of his *invincible* conqueror. The same measure of punishment, with which, in the days of his prosperity, he was accused of menacing his rival, was inflicted on Attalus himself: he was condemned, after the amputation of two fingers, to a perpetual exile in the isle of Lipari, where he was supplied with the decent necessaries of life. The remainder of the reign of Honorius was undisturbed by rebellion; and it may be observed, that, in the space of five years, seven usurpers had yielded to the fortune of a prince, who was himself incapable either of counsel or of action.

The situation of Spain, separated, on all sides, from the enemies of Rome, by the sea, by the mountains, and by intermediate provinces, had secured the long tranquillity of that remote and sequestered country; and we may observe, as a sure symptom of domestic happiness, that, in a period of four hundred years, Spain furnished very few materials to the history of the Roman empire. The footsteps of the Barbarians, who, in the reign of Gallienus, had penetrated beyond the Pyrenees, were soon obliterated by the return of peace; and in the fourth century of the Christian æra, the cities of Emerita or Merida, of Corduba, Seville, Bracara, and Tarragona, were numbered with the most illustrious of the Roman world. The various plenty of the animal, the vegetable, and the mineral kingdoms, was improved and manufactured by the skill of an industrious people; and the peculiar advantages of naval stores contributed to support an extensive and profitable trade.[1] The arts and sciences flourished under the protection of the emperors; and if the character of the Spaniards was enfeebled by peace and servitude, the hostile approach of the Germans, who had spread terror and desolation from the Rhine to the Pyrenees, seemed to rekindle some sparks of military ardour. As long as the defence of the mountains was entrusted to the hardy and faithful militia of the country, they successively repelled the frequent attempts of the Barbarians. But no sooner had the national troops been compelled to resign their post to the Honorian bands, in the service of Constantine; than the gates of Spain were (A.D. 409. Oct. 13) treacherously betrayed to the public enemy, about ten months before the sack of Rome

[1] Without recurring to the more ancient writers, I shall quote three respectable testimonies which belong to the fourth and seventh centuries; the Expositio totius Mundi (p. 16. vol. iii. Hudson's Minor Geog.), Auson. (de Claris Urbibus, p. 242. ed. Toll.), and Isidore of Seville (Præfat. ad Chron. ap. Grot. Hist. Goth. p. 707.). Many particulars relative to the fertility and trade of Spain, may be found in Nonnius, Hispania Illustrata, and in Huet, Hist. du Com. des Anciens, c. 40. p. 228.

by the Goths.[1] The consciousness of guilt, and the thirst of rapine, prompted the mercenary guards of the Pyrenees to desert their station; to invite the arms of the Suevi, the Vandals, and the Alani; and to swell the torrent which was poured with irresistible violence from the frontiers of Gaul to the sea of Africa. The misfortunes of Spain may be described in the language of its most eloquent historian, who has concisely expressed the passionate, and perhaps exaggerated, declamations of contemporary writers.[2] "The irruption of these nations was "followed by the most dreadful calamities: as the Barbarians exercised "their indiscriminate cruelty on the fortunes of the Romans and the "Spaniards; and ravaged with equal fury the cities and the open "country. The progress of famine reduced the miserable inhabitants "to feed on the flesh of their fellow-creatures; and even the wild "beasts, who multiplied, without controul, in the desert, were exasper-"ated, by the taste of blood, and the impatience of hunger, boldly to "attack and devour their human prey. Pestilence soon appeared, the "inseparable companion of famine; a large proportion of the people "was swept away; and the groans of the dying excited only the envy "of their surviving friends. At length the Barbarians, satiated with "carnage and rapine, and afflicted by the contagious evils which they "themselves had introduced, fixed their permanent seats in the de-"populated country. The ancient Gallicia, whose limits included the "kingdom of Old Castile, was divided between the Suevi and the "Vandals; the Alani were scattered over the provinces of Carthagena "and Lusitania, from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic Ocean; and "the fruitful territory of Bœtica was allotted to the Silingi, another "branch of the Vandalic nation. After regulating this partition, the "conquerors contracted with their new subjects some reciprocal en-"gagements of protection and obedience: the lands were again culti-"vated; and the towns and villages were again occupied by a captive "people. The greatest part of the Spaniards was even disposed to "prefer this new condition of poverty and barbarism, to the severe op-"pressions of the Roman government; yet there were many who still "asserted their native freedom; and who refused, more especially in "the mountains of Gallicia, to submit to the Barbarian yoke."[3]

The important present of the heads of Jovinus and Sebastian, had approved the friendship of Adolphus, and restored Gaul to the obedience of his brother Honorius. Peace was incompatible with the situation and temper of the king of the Goths. He readily accepted the proposal (A.D. 414) of turning his victorious arms against the Barbarians of Spain: the troops of Constantius intercepted his communication with the sea-ports of Gaul, and gently pressed his march towards

[1] The date is accurately fixed in the Fasti, and Chron. of Idatius. Oros. (l. vii. c. 40. p. 578.) imputes the loss of Spain to the treachery of the Honorians; while Soz. (l. ix. c. 12.) accuses only their negligence.

[2] Idatius wishes to apply the Prophecies of Daniel to these national calamities; and is therefore obliged to accommodate the circumstances of the event to the terms of the prediction.

[3] Mariana de Rebus Hispan. l. v. c. 1. i. 148. Hag. Comit. 1733. He had read, in Oros. (l. vii. c. 41. p. 579.), that the Barbarians had turned their swords into ploughshares: and that many of the Prvoincials preferred, inter Barbaros pauperem libertatem quam inter Romanos tributariam solicitudinem sustinere.

the Pyrenees[1] he passed the mountains, and surprised, in the name of the emperor, the city of Barcelona. The fondness of Adolphus for his Roman bride, was not abated by time; and the birth of a son, surnamed, from his illustrious grandsire, Theodosius, appeared to fix him for ever in the interest of the republic. The loss of that infant, whose remains were deposited in a silver coffin in one of the churches near Barcelona, afflicted his parents; but the grief of the Gothic king was suspended by the labours of the field; and the course of his victories was soon interrupted by domestic treason. He had imprudently received into his service one of the followers of Sarus; a Barbarian of a daring spirit, but of a diminutive stature; whose secret desire of revenging the death of his beloved patron, was continually irritated by the sarcasms of his insolent master. Adolphus was (A.D. 415. Aug.) assassinated in the palace of Barcelona; the laws of the succession were violated by a tumultuous faction;[2] and a stranger to the royal race, Singeric, the brother of Sarus himself, was seated on the Gothic throne. The first act of his reign was the inhuman murder of the six children of Adolphus, the issue of a former marriage, whom he tore, without pity, from the feeble arms of a venerable bishop.[3] The unfortunate Placidia, instead of the respectful compassion, which she might have excited in the most savage breasts, was treated with cruel and wanton insult. The daughter of the emperor Theodosius, confounded among the crowd of vulgar captives, was compelled to march on foot above twelve miles, before the horse of a Barbarian, the assassin of an husband whom Placidia loved and lamented.[4]

But Placidia soon obtained the pleasure of revenge; and the view of her ignominious sufferings might rouse an indignant people against the tyrant, who was assassinated on the seventh day of his usurpation. After the death of Singeric, the free choice of the nation bestowed the Gothic sceptre (A.D. 415—418) on Wallia; whose warlike and ambitious temper appeared, in the beginning of his reign, extremely hostile to the republic. He marched in arms, from Barcelona to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, which the ancients revered and dreaded as the boundary of the world. But when he reached the southern promontory of Spain,[5] and, from the rock now covered by the fortress of Gibraltar, contemplated the neighbouring and fertile coast of Africa, Wallia resumed the designs of conquest, which had been interrupted by the death of Alaric. The winds and waves again disappointed the enterprise of the Goths; and the minds of a superstitious people were deeply affected by the repeated disasters of storms and shipwrecks. In this disposition, the successor of Adolphus no longer re-

[1] This mixture of force and persuasion may be fairly inferred from comparing Orosius and Jornandes, the Roman and the Gothic historian.

[2] According to the system of Jornan. (c. 33. p. 659.), the true hereditary right to the Gothic sceptre was vested in the *Amali*; but those princes, who were the vassals of the Huns, commanded the tribes of the Ostrogoths in some distant parts of Germany or Scythia.

[3] The murder is related by Olympiodorus; but the number of the children is taken from an epitaph of suspected authority.

[4] The death of Adolphus was celebrated at Constantinople with illuminations and Circensian games. (Chron. Alexandrin.) It may seem doubtful, whether the Greeks were actuated, on this occasion, by their hatred of the Barbarians, or of the Latins.

[5] Quod *Tartessiacis* avus hujus Vallia *terris* Stravit, et occiduam texêre cadavera *Calpen* Vandalicas turmas, et juncti Martis Alanos

Sidon. Apollin. in Paneg. Anthem. 363. p. 300. ed. Sirmond.

fused to listen to a Roman ambassador, whose proposals were enforced by the real, or supposed, approach of a numerous army, under the conduct of the brave Constantius. A solemn treaty was stipulated and observed: Placidia was honourably restored to her brother; 600,000 measures of wheat were delivered to the hungry Goths;[1] and Wallia engaged to draw his sword in the service of the empire. A bloody war was instantly excited among the Barbarians of Spain; and the contending princes are said to have addressed their letters, their ambassadors, and their hostages, to the throne of the Western emperor, exhorting him to remain a tranquil spectator of their contest; the events of which must be favourable to the Romans, by the mutual slaughter of their common enenies.[2] The Spanish war was obstinately supported, during three campaigns, with desperate valour, and various success; and the martial achievements of Wallia diffused through the empire the superior renown of the Gothic hero. He exterminated the Silingi, who had irretrievably ruined the elegant plenty of the province of Bœtica. He slew, in battle, the king of the Alani; and the remains of those Scythian wanderers, who escaped from the field, instead of chusing a new leader, humbly sought a refuge under the standard of the Vandals, with whom they were ever afterwards confounded. The Vandals themselves, and the Suevi, yielded to the efforts of the invincible Goths. The promiscuous multitude of Barbarians, whose retreat had been intercepted, were driven into the mountains of Gallicia; where they still continued, in a narrow compass, and on a barren soil, to exercise their domestic and implacable hostilities. In the pride of victory, Wallia was faithful to his engagements: he restored his Spanish conquests to the obedience of Honorius; and the tyranny of the Imperial officers soon reduced an oppressed people to regret the time of their Barbarian servitude. While the event of the war was still doubtful, the first advantages obtained by the arms of Wallia, had encouraged the court of Ravenna to decree the honours of a triumph to their feeble sovereign. He entered Rome like the ancient conquerors of nations; and if the monuments of servile corruption had not long since met with the fate which they deserved, we should probably find that a crowd of poets, and orators, of magistrates, and bishops, applauded the fortune, the wisdom, and the invincible courage, of the emperor Honorius.[3]

Such a triumph might have been justly claimed by the ally of Rome, if Wallia, before he repassed the Pyrenees, had extirpated the seeds of the Spanish war. His victorious Goths, forty-three years after they had passed the Danube, were (A.D. 419) established, according to the faith of treaties, in the possession of the second Aquitain; a maritime

[1] This supply was very acceptable: the Goths were insulted by the Vandals of Spain with the epithet of *Truli*, because, in their extreme distress, they had given a piece of gold for a *trula*, or about half a pound of flour. Olympiod. apud Phot. p. 189.

[2] Orosius inserts a copy of these pretended letters. Tu cum omnibus pacem habe, omniumque obsides accipe; nos nobis confligimus, nobis perimus, tibi vincimus; immortalis vero quæstus erat Reipublicæ tuæ, si utrique pereamus. The idea is just; but I cannot persuade myself that it was entertained, or expressed, by the Barbarians.

[3] Romam triumphans ingreditur, is the formal expression of Prosper's Chronicle. The facts which relate to the death of Adolphus, and the exploits of Wallia, are related from Olympiod. (apud Phot. p. 188.), Oros. (l. vii. c. 43. p. 584.), Jornan. (de Reb. Geti. c. 31, 32.), and the Chronicles of Idatius and Isidore.

province between the Garonne and the Loire, under the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Bourdeaux. That metropolis, advantageously situated for the trade of the ocean, was built in a regular and elegant form; and its numerous inhabitants were distinguished among the Gauls by their wealth, their learning, and the politeness of their manners. The adjacent province, which has been fondly compared to the garden of Eden, is blessed with a fruitful soil, and a temperate climate; the face of the country displayed the arts and the rewards of industry; and the Goths, after their martial toils, luxuriously exhausted the rich vineyards of Aquitain.[1] The Gothic limits were enlarged by the additional gift of some neighbouring dioceses; and the successors of Alaric fixed their royal residence at Thoulouse, which included five populous quarters, or cities, within the spacious circuit of its walls. About the same time, in the last years of the reign of Honorius, the GOTHS, the BURGUNDIANS, and the FRANKS, obtained a permanent seat and dominion in the provinces of Gaul. The liberal grant of the usurper Jovinus to his Burgundian allies, was confirmed by the lawful emperor; the lands of the First, or Upper, Germany, were ceded to those formidable Barbarians; and they gradually occupied, either by conquest or treaty, the two provinces which still retain, with the titles of *Duchy* and of *County*, the national appellation of Burgundy.[2] The Franks, the valiant and faithful allies of the Roman republic, were soon tempted to imitate the invaders, whom they had so bravely resisted. Treves, the capital of Gaul, was pillaged by their lawless bands; and the humble colony, which they so long maintained in the district of Toxandria, in Brabant, insensibly multiplied along the banks of the Meuse and Scheld, till their independent power filled the whole extent of the Second, or Lower, Germany. These facts may be sufficiently justified by historic evidence: but the foundation of the French monarchy by Pharamond, the conquests, the laws, and even the existence, of that hero, have been justly arraigned by the impartial severity of modern criticism.[3]

The ruin of the opulent provinces of Gaul may be dated from the establishment (A.D. 420, &c.) of these Barbarians, whose alliance was dangerous and oppressive, and who were capriciously impelled, by interest or passion, to violate the public peace. A heavy and partial ransom was imposed on the surviving provincials, who had escaped the calamities of war; the fairest and most fertile lands were assigned to the rapacious strangers, for the use of their families, their slaves and their cattle; and the trembling natives relinquished with a sigh the inheritance of their fathers. Yet these domestic misfortunes, which are seldom the lot of a vanquished people, had been felt and

[1] Auson. (de Claris Urbibus, p. 257.) celebrates Bourdeaux with the partial affection of a native. Salvian (de Gubern. Dei, p. 228. Paris, 1608.), a florid description of the provinces of Aquitain and Novempopulania.

[2] Oros. (l. vii. c. 32. p. 550.) commends the mildness and modesty of these Burgundians, who treated their subjects of Gaul as their Christian brethren. Mascou has illustrated the origin of their kingdom in the four first annotations at the end of his laborious History of the Ancient Germans, ii. 555. of the English translation.

[3] Mascou, l. viii. c. 43, 44, 45. Except in a short and suspicious line of the Chronicle of Prosper (i. 638.), the name of Pharamond is never mentioned before the seventh century. The author of the Gesta Francorum (ii. 543.) suggests, probably enough, that the choice of Pharamond, or at least of a king, was recommended to the Franks by his father Marcomir, who was an exile in Tuscany.

inflicted by the Romans themselves, not only in the insolence of foreign conquest, but in the madness of civil discord. The Triumvirs proscribed eighteen of the most flourishing colonies of Italy; and distributed their lands and houses to the veterans who revenged the death of Cæsar, and oppressed the liberty of their country. Two poets, of unequal fame, have deplored, in similar circumstances, the loss of their patrimony; but the legionaries of Augustus appear to have surpassed, in violence and injustice, the Barbarians, who invaded Gaul, under the reign of Honorius. It was not without the utmost difficulty that Virgil escaped from the sword of the Centurion, who had usurped his farm in the neighbourhood of Mantua;[1] but Paulinus of Bourdeaux received a sum of money from his Gothic purchaser, which he accepted with pleasure and surprise; and, though it was much inferior to the real value of his estate, this act of rapine was disguised by some colours of moderation and equity.[2] The odious name of conquerors, was softened into the mild and friendly appellation of the *guests* of the Romans; and the Barbarians of Gaul, more especially the Goths, repeatedly declared, that they were bound to the people by the ties of hospitality, and to the emperor by the duty of allegiance and military service. The title of Honorius and his successors, their laws, and their civil magistrates, were still respected in the provinces of Gaul, of which they had resigned the possession to the Barbarian allies; and the kings, who exercised a supreme and independent authority over their native subjects, ambitiously solicited the more honourable rank of master-generals of the Imperial armies.[3] Such was the involuntary reverence which the Roman name still impressed on the minds of those warriors, who had borne away in triumph the spoils of the Capitol.

Whilst Italy was ravaged by the Goths, and a succession of feeble tyrants oppressed the provinces beyond the Alps, the British island separated (A.D. 409) itself from the body of the Roman empire. The regular forces which guarded that remote province, had been gradually withdrawn; and Britain was abandoned, without defence, to the Saxon pirates, and the savages of Ireland and Caledonia. The Britons, reduced to this extremity, no longer relied on the tardy and doubtful aid of a declining monarchy. They assembled in arms, repelled the invaders, and rejoiced in the important discovery of their own strength.[4] Afflicted by similar calamities, and actuated by the same spirit, the Armorican provinces (a name which comprehended

[1] O Lycida, vivi pervenimus: advena nostri
(Quod nunquam veriti sumus) ut possessor agelli
Diceret: Hæc mea sunt; veteres migrate coloni.
Nunc victi tristes, &c.

See the whole of the 9th eclogue, with the useful Commentary of Servius. Fifteen miles of the Mantuan territory were assigned to the veterans, with a reservation in favour of the inhabitants of 3 miles round the city. Even in this favour they were cheated by Alfenus Varus, a famous lawyer, and one of the commissioners, who measured 800 paces of water and morass.

[2] See the remarkable passage of the Eucharisticon of Paulinus, 575. apud Mascou, l. viii. c. 42.

[3] This important truth is established by the accuracy of Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 641.), and by the ingenuity of Dubos (Hist. de l'Etabliss. de la Mon. Franç. dans les Gaules, i. 259.).

[4] Zos. (l. vi. 383. 476), relates in a few words the revolt of Britain and Armorica. Our antiquarians, even the great Cambden himself, have been betrayed into many gross errors, by their imperfect knowledge of the history of the continent

the maritime countries of Gaul between the Seine and the Loire)[1] resolved to imitate the example of the neighbouring island. They expelled the Roman magistrates, who acted under the authority of the usurper Constantine; and a free government was established among a people who had so long been subject to the arbitrary will of a master. The independence of Britain and Armorica was soon confirmed by Honorius himself, the lawful emperor of the West; and the letters, by which he committed to the new states the care of their own safety, might be interpreted as an absolute and perpetual abdication of the exercise and rights or sovereignty. This interpretation was, in some measure, justified by the event. After the usurpers of Gaul had successively fallen, the maritime provinces were restored to the empire. Yet their obedience was imperfect and precarious: the vain, inconstant, rebellious disposition of the people, was incompatible either with freedom of servitude;[2] and Armorica, though it could not long maintain the form of a republic,[3] was agitated by frequent and destructive revolts. Britain was irrecoverably lost.[4] But as the emperors wisely acquiesced in the independence of a remote province, the separation was not embittered by the reproach of tyranny or rebellion; and the claims of allegiance and protection were succeeded by the mutual and voluntary offices of national friendship.[5]

This revolution dissolved the artificial fabric of civil and military government; and the independent country, during a period (A.D. 409—449) of forty years, till the descent of the Saxons, was ruled by the authority of the clergy, the nobles, and the municipal towns.[6] I. Zosimus, who alone has preserved the memory of this singular transaction, very accurately observes, that the letters of Honorius were addressed to the *cities* of Britain.[7] Under the protection of the Romans, 92 considerable towns had arisen in the several parts of that great province; and, among these, 33 cities were distinguished above

[1] The limits of Armorica are defined by two national geographers, Messieurs de Valois and d'Anville, in their *Notitias* of Ancient Gaul. The word had been used in a more extensive, and was afterwards contracted to a much narrower, signification.

[2] Gens inter geminos notissima clauditur amnes,
Armoricana prius veteri cognomine dicta.
Torva, ferox, ventosa, procax, incauta, rebellis;
Inconstans, disparque sibi novitatis amore;
Prodiga verborum, sed non et prodiga facti.

Erricus, Monach. in Vit. St. Germani, l. v. apud Vales. Notit. Galliarum, p. 43. Valesius alleges several testimonies to confirm this character; to which I shall add the evidence of the presbyter Constantine (A.D. 488.), who, in the Life of St. Germain, calls the Armorican rebels, mobilem et indisciplinatum populum. Historians of France, i. 643.

[3] I thought it necessary to enter my protest against this part of the system of Dubos which Montesquieu has so vigorously opposed. Esprit des Loix, l. xxx. c. 24.

[4] Βρεταννιαν μεν τοι Ρωμαιοι ανασωσασθαι ουκετιεχον, are the words of Procop. (de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 2. p. 181. Louvre edition), in a very important passage, which has been too much neglected. Even Bede (Hist. Gent. Anglican. l. i. c. 12. p. 50. edit. Smith) acknowledges that the Romans finally left Britain in the reign of Honorius. Yet our modern historians and antiquaries extend the term of their dominion; and there are some who allow only the interval of a few months between their departure and the arrival of the Saxons.

[5] Bede has not forgot the occasional aid of the legions against the Scots and Picts; and more authentic proof will hereafter be produced, that the independent Britons raised 12,000 men for the service of the emperor Anthemius, in Gaul.

[6] I owe it to myself, and to historic truth, to declare, that some *circumstances* in this paragraph are founded only on conjecture and analogy. The stubbornness of our language has sometimes forced me to deviate from the *conditional* into the *indicative* mood.

[7] Προς τας εν Βρεταννια πολεις. Zos. l. vi. 383.

the rest by their superior privileges and importance.[1] Each of these cities, as in all the other provinces of the empire, formed a legal corporation, for the purpose of regulating their domestic policy; and the powers of municipal government were distributed among annual magistrates, a select senate, and the assembly of the people, according to the original model of the Roman constitution.—*Maffei Verona Illustrata*, part i. l. v. 83. The management of a common revenue, the exercise of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and the habits of public counsel and command, were inherent to these petty republics; and when they asserted their independence, the youth of the city, and of the adjacent districts, would naturally range themselves under the standard of the magistrate. But the desire of obtaining the advantages, and of escaping the burthens, of political society, is a perpetual and inexhaustible source of discord; nor can it reasonably be presumed, that the restoration of British freedom was exempt from tumult and faction. The pre-eminence of birth and fortune must have been frequently violated by bold and popular citizens; and the haughty nobles, who complained that they were become the subjects of their own servants,[2] would sometimes regret the reign of an arbitrary monarch. II. The jurisdiction of each city over the adjacent country, was supported by the patrimonial influence of the principal senators; and the smaller towns, the villages, and the proprietors of land, consulted their own safety by adhering to the shelter of these rising republics. The sphere of their attraction was proportioned to the respective degrees of their wealth and populousness; but the hereditary lords of ample possessions, who were not oppressed by the neighbourhood of any powerful city, aspired to the rank of independent princes, and boldly exercised the rights of peace and war. The gardens and villas, which exhibited some faint imitation of Italian elegance, would soon be converted into strong castles, the refuge, in time of danger, of the adjacent country:[3] the produce of the land was applied to purchase arms and horses; to maintain a military force of slaves, of peasants, and of licentious followers; and the chieftain might assume, within his own domain, the powers of a civil magistrate. Several of these British chiefs might be the genuine posterity of ancient kings; and many more would be tempted to adopt this honourable genealogy, and to vindicate their hereditary claims, which had been suspended by the usurpation of the Cæsars.[4] Their situation, and their hopes, would dispose them to affect the dress, the language, and the customs of their ancestors. If the *princes* of Britain relapsed into barbarism,

[1] Two cities of Britain were *municipia*, nine *colonies*, ten *Latii jure donatæ*, twelve *stipendiariæ* of eminent note. This detail is taken from Richard of Cirencester, de Sitû Britanniæ, p. 36.; and though it may not seem probable, that he wrote from the MSS. of a Roman general, he shows a genuine knowledge of antiquity, very extraordinary for a monk of the fourteenth century.

[2] Leges restituit, libertatemque reducit, Et servos famulis non sinit esse suis.
Itinerar. Rutil. l. i. 215.

[3] An inscription (apud Sirmond. Not. ad Sidon. Apollinar. p. 59.) describes a castle, cum muris et portis, tuitioni omnium, erected by Dardanus on his own estate, near Sisteron, in the second Narbonnese, and named by him Theopolis.

[4] The establishment of their power would have been easy indeed, if we could adopt the impracticable scheme of a lively and learned antiquarian; who supposes, that the British monarchs of the several tribes continued to reign, though with subordinate jurisdiction, from the time of Claudius to that of Honorius. Whitaker's Hist. of Manchest. i. 247.

while the *cities* studiously preserved the laws and manners of Rome, the whole island must have been gradually divided by the distinction of two national parties; again broken into a thousand subdivisions of war and faction, by the various provocations of interest and resentment. The public strength, instead of being united against a foreign enemy, was consumed in obscure and intestine quarrels; and the personal merit which had placed a successful leader at the head of his equals, might enable him to subdue the freedom of some neighbouring cities; and to claim a rank among the *tyrants*,[1] who infested Britain after the dissolution of the Roman government. III. The British church might be composed of thirty or forty bishops,[2] with an adequate proportion of the inferior clergy; and the want of riches (for they seem to have been poor)[3] would compel them to deserve the public esteem, by a decent and exemplary behaviour. The interest, as well as the temper, of the clergy, was favourable to the peace and union of their distracted country; those salutary lessons might be frequently inculcated in their popular discourses; and the episcopal synods were the only councils that could pretend to the weight and authority of a national assembly. In such councils, where the princes and magistrates sat promiscuously with the bishops, the important affairs of the state, as well as of the church, might be freely debated; differences reconciled, alliances formed, contributions imposed, wise resolutions often concerted, and sometimes executed; and there is reason to believe, that, in moments of extreme danger, a *Pendragon*, or Dictator, was elected by the general consent of the Britons. These pastoral cares, so worthy of the episcopal character, were interrupted, however, by zeal and superstition; and the British clergy incessantly laboured to eradicate the Pelagian heresy, which they abhorred, as the peculiar disgrace of their native country.—*Usher*, *de Antiq. Eccles. Britan.* c. 8—12.

It is somewhat remarkable, or rather it is extremely natural, that the revolt of Britain and Armorica should have introduced an appearance of liberty into the obedient provinces of Gaul. In a solemn edict[4] (A.D. 418), filled with the strongest assurances of that paternal affection which princes so often express, and so seldom feel, the emperor Honorius promulgated his intention of convening an annual assembly of the *seven provinces:* a name peculiarly appropriated to Aquitain, and the ancient Narbonnese, which had long since exchanged their Celtic rudeness for the useful and elegant arts of Italy.[5]

[1] Αλλ' ουσα υπο τυραννοις απ' αυτου εμενε. Procop. de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 2. p. 181. Britannia fertilis provincia tyrannorum, was the expression of Jerom, in the year 415 (ii. 255. ad Ctesiphont.). By the pilgrims, who resorted every year to the Holy Land, the monk of Bethlem received the earliest and most accurate intelligence.

[2] Bingham's Eccles. Antiq. i. l. ix. c. 6. p. 394.

[3] It is reported of *three* British bishops who assisted at the council of Rimini, A.D. 359. tam pauperes fuisse ut nihil haberent. Sulpic. Sever. Hist. Sacra, l. ii. 420. Some of their brethren, however, were in better circumstances.

[4] See the correct text of this edict, as published by Sirmond (Not. ad Sidon. Apollin. p. 147.). Hincmar, of Rheims, who assigns a place to the *bishops*, had probably seen (in the ninth century) a more perfect copy. Dubos, Hist. Critique de la Monarch. Franç. i. 241.

[5] It is evident from the *Notitia*, that the seven provinces were the Viennensis, the maritime Alps, the first and second Narbonnese, Novempopulania, and the first and second Aquitain. In the room of the first Aquitain, the Abbe Dubos, on the authority of Hincmar desires to introduce the first Lugdunensis, or Lyonnese.

Arles, the seat of government and commerce, was appointed for the place of the assembly; which regularly continued twenty-eight days, from August 15 to September 13, of every year. It consisted of the Prætorian præfect of the Gauls; of seven provincial governors, one consular and six presidents; of the magistrates, and perhaps the bishops, of about sixty cities; and of a competent, though indefinite, number of the most honourable and opulent *possessors* of land, who might justly be considered as the representatives of their country. They were empowered to interpret and communicate the laws of their sovereign; to expose the grievances and wishes of their constituents; to moderate the excessive or unequal weight of taxes; and to deliberate on every subject of local or national importance, that could tend to the restoration of the peace and prosperity of the seven provinces. If such an institution, which gave the people an interest in their own government, had been universally established by Trajan or the Antonines, the seeds of public wisdom and virtue might have been cherished and propagated in the empire of Rome. The privileges of the subject would have secured the throne of the monarch; the abuses of an arbitrary administration might have been prevented, in some degree, or corrected, by the interposition of these representative assemblies; and the country would have been defended against a foreign enemy, by the arms of natives and freemen. Under the mild and generous influence of liberty, the Roman empire might have remained invincible and immortal; or if its excessive magnitude, and the instability of human affairs, had opposed such perpetual continuance, its vital and constituent members might have separately preserved their vigour and independence. But in the decline of the empire, when every principle of health and life had been exhausted, the tardy application of this partial remedy was incapable of producing any important or salutary effects. The emperor Honorius expresses his surprise, that he must compel the reluctant provinces to accept a privilege which they should ardently have solicited. A fine of three, or even five, pounds of gold, was imposed on the absent representatives; who seem to have declined this imaginary gift of a free constitution, as the last and most cruel insult of their oppressors.

CHAPTER XXXII.

Arcadius Emperor of the East.—Administration and Disgrace of Eutropius.—Revolt of Gainas.—Persecution of St. John Chrysostom.—Theodosius II. *Emperor of the East.—His Sister Pulcheria.—His Wife Eudocia.—The Persian War, and Division of Armenia.*

THE division of the Roman world between the sons of Theodosius, marks the final establishment of the empire of the East (A.D. 395—1453), which, from the reign of Arcadius to the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, subsisted 1058 years, in a state of premature and perpetual

decay. The sovereign of that empire assumed, and obstinately retained (A.D. 395—408), the vain, and at length fictitious, title of Emperor of the ROMANS; and the hereditary appellations of CÆSAR and AUGUSTUS continued to declare, that he was the legitimate successor of the first of men, who had reigned over the first of nations. The palace of Constantinople rivalled, and perhaps excelled, the magnificence of Persia; and the eloquent sermons of St. Chrysostom[1] celebrate, while they condemn, the pompous luxury of the reign of Arcadius. "The emperor," says he, "wears on his head either a "diadem, or a crown of gold, decorated with precious stones of in"estimable value. These ornaments, and his purple garments, are "reserved for his sacred person alone; and his robes of silk are "embroidered with the figures of golden dragons. His throne is of "massy gold. Whenever he appears in public, he is surrounded by "his courtiers, his guards, and his attendants. Their spears, their "shields, their cuirasses, the bridles and trappings of their horses, "have either the substance, or the appearance, of gold; and the large "splendid boss in the midst of their shield is encircled with smaller "bosses, which represent the shape of the human eye. The two mules "that draw the chariot of the monarch, are perfectly white, and shin"ing all over with gold. The chariot itself, of pure and solid gold, "attracts the admiration of the spectators, who contemplate the "purple curtains, the snowy carpet, the size of the precious stones, "and the resplendent plates of gold, that glitter as they are agitated by "the motion of the carriage. The Imperial pictures are white, on a "blue ground; the emperor appears seated on his throne, with his arms, "his horses, and his guards beside him; and his vanquished enemies "in chains at his feet." The successors of Constantine established their perpetual residence in the royal city, which he had erected on the verge of Europe and Asia. Inaccessible to the menaces of their enemies, and perhaps to the complaints of their people, they received, with each wind, the tributary productions of every climate; while the impregnable strength of their capital continued for ages to defy the hostile attempts of the Barbarians. Their dominions were bounded by the Hadriatic and the Tigris; and the whole interval of twenty-five days' navigation, which separated the extreme cold of Scythia from the torrid zone of Æthiopia,[2] was comprehended within the limits of the empire of the East. The populous countries of that empire were the seat of art and learning, of luxury and wealth; and the inhabitants, who had assumed the language and manners of Greeks, styled themselves, with some appearance of truth, the most enlightened and civilized portion of the human species. The form of government was

[1] Montfaucon, who, by the command of his Benedictine superiors, was compelled (see Longueruana, i. 205.) to execute the laborious edition of St. Chrysostom, in 13 vols. fol. (Paris 1738.), amused himself with extracting from that immense collection of morals, some curious *antiquities*, which illustrate the manners of the Theodosian age (Chrysost. Opera, xiii. 192.), and French Dissertation, in the Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscript. xiii. 474.

[2] According to the loose reckoning, that a ship could sail, with a fair wind, 1000 stadia, or 125 miles, in the revolution of a day and night; Diodorus Siculus computes 10 days from the Palus Mœotis to Rhodes, and 4 days from Rhodes to Alexandria. The navigation of the Nile, from Alexandria to Syene, under the tropic of Cancer, required, as it was against the stream, 10 days more. Diodor. Sicul. i. l. iii. p. 200. ed. Wessel. He might, without much impropriety, measure the extreme heat from the verge of the torrid zone; but he speaks of the Mœotis in the 47th degree of northern latitude, as if it lay within the polar circle.

a pure and simple monarchy; the name of the ROMAN REPUBLIC, which so long preserved a faint tradition of freedom, was confined to the Latin provinces; and the princes of Constantinople measured their greatness by the servile obedience of their people. They were ignorant how much this passive disposition enervates and degrades every faculty of the mind. The subjects, who had resigned their will to the absolute commands of a master, were equally incapable of guarding their lives and fortunes against the assaults of the Barbarians, or of defending their reason from the terrors of superstition.

The first events of the reign of Arcadius and Honorius are so intimately connected, that the rebellion of the Goths, and the fall of Rufinus, have already claimed a place in the history of the West. It has already been observed, that Eutropius,[1] one of the principal eunuchs of the palace of Constantinople, succeeded (A.D. 395—399) the haughty minister whose ruin he had accomplished, and whose vices he soon imitated. Every order of the state bowed to the new favourite; and their tame and obsequious submission encouraged him to insult the laws, and, what is still more difficult and dangerous, the manners of his country. Under the weakest of the predecessors of Arcadius, the reign of the eunuchs had been secret and almost invisible. They insinuated themselves into the confidence of the prince; but their ostensible functions were confined to the menial service of the wardrobe and Imperial bed-chamber. They might direct, in a whisper, the public counsels, and blast, by their malicious suggestions, the fame and fortunes of the most illustrious citizens; but they never presumed to stand forward in the front of empire,[2] or to profane the public honours of the state. Eutropius was the first of his artificial sex, who dared to assume the character of a Roman magistrate and general.[3] Sometimes, in the presence of the blushing senate, he ascended the tribunal, to pronounce judgment, or to repeat elaborate harangues; and sometimes appeared on horseback, at the head of his troops, in the dress and armour of a hero. The disregard of custom and decency always betrays a weak and ill-regulated mind; nor does Eutropius seem to have compensated for the folly of the design, by any superior merit or ability in the execution. His former habits of life had not introduced him to the study of the laws, or the exercises of the field;

[1] Barthius, who adored his author with the blind superstition of a commentator, gives the preference to the two books which Claudian composed against Eutropius, above all his other productions (Baillet, Jugemens des Savans, iv. p. 227.). They are indeed a very elegant and spirited satire; and would be more valuable in an historical light, if the invective were less vague, and more temperate.

[2] After lamenting the progress of the eunuchs in the Roman palace, and defining their proper functions, Claudian adds,

——A fronte recedant Imperii.
In Eutrop. i. 422.

Yet it does not appear that the eunuch had assumed any of the efficient offices of the empire; and he is styled only Præpositus sacri cubiculi, in the edict of his banishment. Cod. Theod. l. ix. tit. xl. leg. 17.

[3] Jamque oblita sui, nec sobria divitiis mens Judicat eunuchus. . . . . . .
In miseras leges hominumque negotia ludit: Arma etiam violare parat. . . .

Claudian (i. 229.), with that mixture of indignation and humour, which always pleases in a satiric poet, describes the insolent folly of the eunuch, the disgrace of the empire, and the joy of the Goths.

——Gaudet, cum viderit hostis, Et sentit jam deesse viros.

his awkward and unsuccessful attempts provoked the secret contempt of the spectators; the Goths expressed their wish, that *such* a general might always command the armies of Rome; and the name of the minister was branded with ridicule, more pernicious perhaps than hatred, to a public character. The subjects of Arcadius were exasperated by the recollection, that this deformed and decrepit eunuch,[1] who so perversely mimicked the actions of a man, was born in the most abject condition of servitude; that, before he entered the Imperial palace, he had been successively sold, and purchased, by an hundred masters, who had exhausted his youthful strength in every mean and infamous office, and at length dismissed him, in his old age, to freedom and poverty.[2] While these disgraceful stories were circulated, and perhaps exaggerated, in private conversations, the vanity of the favourite was flattered with the most extraordinary honours. In the senate, in the capital, in the provinces, the statues of Eutropius were erected, in brass, or marble, decorated with the symbols of his civil and military virtues, and inscribed with the pompous title of the third founder of Constantinople. He was promoted to the rank of *patrician*, which began to signify, in a popular, and even legal acceptation, the father of the emperor; and the last year of the fourth century was polluted by the *consulship* of an eunuch, and a slave. This strange and inexpiable prodigy[3] awakened, however, the prejudices of the Romans. The effeminate consul was rejected by the West, as an indelible stain to the annals of the republic; and, without invoking the shades of Brutus and Camillus, the colleague of Eutropius, a learned and respectable magistrate,[4] sufficiently represented the different maxims of the two administrations.

The bold and vigorous mind of Rufinus seems to have been actuated by a more sanguinary and revengeful spirit; but the avarice of the eunuch was not less insatiate than that of the præfect.[5] As long as he despoiled the oppressors, who had enriched themselves with the plunder of the people, Eutropius might gratify his covetous

[1] The poet's lively description of his deformity (i. 110—125.) is confirmed by the authentic testimony of Chrysost. (iii. 384. ed. Montfaucon); who observes, that when the paint was washed away, the face of Eutropius appeared more ugly and wrinkled than that of an old woman. Claudian remarks (i. 469.), and the remark must have been founded on experience, that there was scarcely any interval between the youth and the decrepit age of an eunuch.

[2] Eutropius appears to have been a native of Armenia or Assyria. His three services, which Claudian more particularly describes, were these: 1. He spent many years as the catamite of Ptolemy, a groom or soldier of the Imperial stables. 2. Ptolemy gave him to the old general Arintheus, for whom he very skilfully exercised the profession of a pimp. 3. He was given, on her marriage, to the daughter of Arintheus; and the future consul was employed to comb her hair, to present the silver ewer, to wash and to fan his mistress in hot weather. See l. i. 31—137.

[3] Claud. (l. i. in Eutrop. i. 22.), after enumerating the various prodigies of monstrous births, speaking animals, showers of blood or stones, double suns, &c. adds, with some exaggeration,

Omnia cesserunt eunucho consule monstra.

The first book concludes with a noble speech of the goddess of Rome to her favourite Honorius, deprecating the *new* ignominy to which she was exposed.

[4] Fl. Mallius Theodorus, whose civil honours, and philosophical works, have been celebrated by Claudian in a very elegant panegyric.

[5] Μεθυων δε ηδη τῳ πλουτῳ, drunk with riches, is the forcible expression of Zos. (l. v. 301.); and the avarice of Eutropius is equally execrated in the Lexicon of Suidas, and the Chronicle of Marcellinus. Chrysostom had often admonished the favourite, of the vanity and danger of immoderate wealth, iii. 381.

disposition without much envy or injustice: but the progress of his rapine soon invaded the wealth which had been acquired by lawful inheritance, or laudable industry. The usual methods of extortion were practised and improved; and Claudian has sketched a lively and original picture of the public auction of the state. "The impotence "of the eunuch" (says that agreeable satirist) "has served only to "stimulate his avarice: the same hand which, in his servile condition, "was exercised in petty thefts, to unlock the coffers of his master, now "grasps the riches of the world; and this infamous broker of the em-"pire appreciates and divides the Roman provinces, from Mount "Hæmus to the Tigris. One man, at the expence of his villa, is made "proconsul of Asia; a second purchases Syria with his wife's jewels; "and a third laments, that he has exchanged his paternal estate for "the government of Bithynia. In the ante-chamber of Eutropius, a "large tablet is exposed to public view, which marks the respective "prices of the provinces. The different value of Pontus, of Galatia, "of Lydia, is accurately distinguished. Lycia may be obtained for so "many thousand pieces of gold; but the opulence of Phrygia will "require a more considerable sum. The eunuch wishes to obliterate, "by the general disgrace, his personal ignominy; and as he has been "sold himself, he is desirous of selling the rest of mankind. In the "eager contention, the balance, which contains the fate and fortunes "of the province, often trembles on the beam; and till one of the "scales is inclined, by a superior weight, the mind of the impartial "judge remains in anxious suspence.[1] Such" (continues the indignant poet) "are the fruits of Roman valour, of the defeat of Antiochus, "and of the triumph of Pompey." This venal prostitution of public honours secured the impunity of *future* crimes; but the riches, which Eutropius derived from confiscation, were *already* stained with injustice; since it was decent to accuse, and to condemn, the proprietors of the wealth which he was impatient to confiscate. Some noble blood was shed by the hand of the executioner; and the most inhospitable extremities of the empire were filled with innocent and illustrious exiles. Among the generals and consuls of the East, Abundantius[2] had reason to dread the first effects of the resentment of Eutropius. He had been guilty of the unpardonable crime of introducing that abject slave to the palace of Constantinople: and some degree of praise must be allowed to a powerful and ungrateful favourite, who was satisfied with the disgrace of his benefactor. Abundantius was stripped of his ample fortunes by an Imperial rescript, and banished to Pityus, on the Euxine, the last frontier of the Roman world; where he subsisted by the precarious mercy of the Barbarians, till he could obtain, after the fall of Eutropius, a milder exile at Sidon

[1] ——certantum sæpe duorum
Diversum suspendit onus: cum pondere Judex
Vergit, et in geminas nutat provincia lances.

Claud. (i. 192.) so curiously distinguishes the circumstances of the sale, that they all seem to allude to particular anecdotes.

[2] Claud. (i. 154.) mentions the *guilt* and exile of Abundantius, nor could he fail to quote the example of the artist, who made the first trial of the brazen bull, which he presented to Phalaris. Zos. l. v. 302. Jerom. i. 26. The difference of place is easily reconciled; but the decisive authority of Asterius of Amasia (Orat. iv. 76. apud Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 435.) must turn the scale in favour of Pityus.

in Phœnicia. The destruction of Timasius[1] required a more serious and regular mode of attack. That great officer, the master-general of the armies of Theodosius, had signalized his valour by a decisive victory, which he obtained over the Goths of Thessaly; but he was too prone, after the example of his sovereign, to enjoy the luxury of peace, and to abandon his confidence to wicked and designing flatterers. Timasius had despised the public clamour, by promoting an infamous dependent to the command of a cohort; and he deserved to feel the ingratitude of Bargus, who was secretly instigated by the favourite to accuse his patron of a treasonable conspiracy. The general was arraigned before the tribunal of Arcadius himself; and the principal eunuch stood by the side of the throne, to suggest the questions and answers of his sovereign. But as this form of trial might be deemed partial and arbitrary, the farther enquiry into the crimes of Timasius was delegated to Saturninus and Procopius; the former of consular rank, the latter still respected as the father-in-law of the emperor Valens. The appearances of a fair and legal proceeding were maintained by the blunt honesty of Procopius; and he yielded with reluctance to the obsequious dexterity of his colleague, who pronounced a sentence of condemnation against the unfortunate Timasius. His immense riches were confiscated, in the name of the emperor, and for the benefit of the favourite; and he was doomed to perpetual exile at Oasis, a solitary spot in the midst of the sandy deserts of Libya.[2] Secluded from all human converse, the master-general of the Roman armies was lost for ever to the world; but the circumstances of his fate have been related in a various and contradictory manner. It is insinuated, that Eutropius dispatched a private order for his secret execution.[3] It was reported, that, in attempting to escape from Oasis, he perished in the desert, of thirst and hunger; and that his dead body was found on the sands of Libya.[4] It has been asserted, with more confidence, that his son Syagrius, after successfully eluding the pursuit of the agents and emissaries of the court, collected a band of African robbers; that he rescued Timasius from the place of his exile; and that both the father and son disappeared from the knowledge of mankind.[5] But the ungrateful Bargus, instead of being suffered to possess the reward of guilt, was soon afterwards circumvented and destroyed, by the more powerful villany of the minister himself; who retained sense and spirit enough to abhor the instrument of his own crimes.

[1] Suidas (most probably from the history of Eunapius) has given a very unfavourable picture of Timasius. The account of his accuser, the judges, trial, &c. is perfectly agreeable to the practice of ancient and modern courts. (Zos. l. v. 298.) I am almost tempted to quote the romance of a great master (Fielding, iv. 49.), which may be considered as the history of human nature.

[2] The great Oasis was one of the spots in the sands of Libya, watered with springs, and capable of producing wheat, barley, and palm-trees. It was about three days' journey from north to south, about half a day in breadth, and at the distance of about five days' march to the west of Abydus, on the Nile. D'Anville, Descrip. de l'Egypte, p. 186. The barren desert which encompasses Oasis (Zos. l. v. 300.) has suggested the idea of comparative fertility, and even the epithet of the *happy island* (Herodot. iii. 26.).

[3] The line of Claudian in Eutrop. l. i. 180.

Marmaricus claris violatur cædibus Hammon,

evidently alludes to *his* persuasion of the death of Timasius.

[4] Soz. l. viii. c. 7. He speaks from report, ως τινος επυθομεν.

[5] Zos. l. v. 300. Yet he seems to suspect that this rumour was spread by the friends of Eutropius.

The public hatred, and the despair of individuals, continually threatened, or seemed to threaten, the personal safety of Eutropius; as well as of the numerous adherents, who were attached to his fortune, and had been promoted by his venal favour. For their mutual defence, he contrived (A D. 397. Sept. 4.) the safeguard of a law, which violated every principle of humanity and justice.[1] I. It is enacted, in the name, and by the authority, of Arcadius, that all those who shall conspire, either with subjects, or with strangers, against the lives of any of the persons whom the emperor considers as the members of his own body, shall be punished with death and confiscation. This species of fictitious and metaphorical treason is extended to protect, not only the *illustrious* officers of the state and army, who are admitted into the sacred consistory, but likewise the principal domestics of the palace, the senators of Constantinople, the military commanders, and the civil magistrates of the provinces: a vague and indefinite list, which, under the successors of Constantine, included an obscure and numerous train of subordinate ministers. II. This extreme severity might perhaps be justified, had it been only directed to secure the representatives of the sovereign from any actual violence in the execution of their office. But the whole body of Imperial dependents claimed a privilege, or rather impunity, which screened them, in the loosest moments of their lives, from the hasty, perhaps the justifiable, resentment of their fellow-citizens: and, by a strange perversion of the laws, the same degree of guilt and punishment was applied to a private quarrel, and to a deliberate conspiracy against the emperor and the empire. The edict of Arcadius most positively and most absurdly declares, that in such cases of treason, *thoughts* and *actions* ought to be punished with equal severity; that the knowledge of a mischievous intention, unless it be instantly revealed, becomes equally criminal with the intention itself;[2] and that those rash men, who shall presume to solicit the pardon of traitors, shall themselves be branded with public and perpetual infamy. III. "With regard to the sons of the traitors" (continues the emperor), "although they ought to share the punishment, since they "will probably imitate the guilt, of their parents; yet, by the special "effect of our Imperial lenity, we grant them their lives: but, at the "same time, we declare them incapable of inheriting, either on the "father's or on the mother's side, or of receiving any gift or legacy, "from the testament either of kinsmen or of strangers. Stigmatized "with hereditary infamy, excluded from the hopes of honours or for-"tune, let them endure the pangs of poverty and contempt, till they "shall consider life as a calamity, and death as a comfort and relief." In such words, so well adapted to insult the feelings of mankind, did

[1] Theod. Code, l. ix. tit. 14. ad legem Corneliam de Sicariis, leg. 3. and the Code of Justinian, l. ix. tit. viii. ad legem Juliam de Majestate, leg. 5. The alteration of the *title*, from murder to treason, was an improvement of the subtle Tribonian. Godefroy, in a formal dissertation, which he has inserted in his Commentary, illustrates this law of Arcadius, and explains all the difficult passages which had been perverted by the jurisconsults of the darker ages. iii. 88.

[2] Bartolus understands a simple and naked consciousness, without any sign of approbation or concurrence. For this opinion, says Baldus, he is now roasting in hell. For my own part, continues the discreet Heineccius (Element. Jur. Civil. l. iv. 411.), I must approve the theory of Bartolus; but in practice I should incline to the sentiment of Baldus. Yet Bartolus was gravely quoted by the lawyers of Cardinal Richelieu; and Eutropius was indirectly guilty of the murder of the virtuous de Thou.

the emperor, or rather his favourite eunuch, applaud the moderation of a law, which transferred the same unjust and inhuman penalties to the children of all those who had seconded, or who had not disclosed, these fictitious conspiracies. Some of the noblest regulations of Roman jurisprudence have been suffered to expire; but this edict, a convenient and forcible engine of ministerial tyranny, was carefully inserted in the codes of Theodosius and Justinian; and the same maxims have been revived in modern ages, to protect the electors of Germany, and the cardinals of the church of Rome.[1]

Yet these sanguinary laws, which spread terror among a disarmed and dispirited people, were of too weak a texture to restrain the bold enterprise (A.D. 399) of Tribigild[2] the Ostrogoth. The colony of that warlike nation, which had been planted by Theodosius in one of the most fertile districts of Phrygia,[3] impatiently compared the slow returns of laborious husbandry, with the successful rapine and liberal rewards of Alaric; and their leader resented, as a personal affront, his own ungracious reception in the palace of Constantinople. A soft and wealthy province, in the heart of the empire, was astonished by the sound of war; and the faithful vassal, who had been disregarded or oppressed, was again respected, as soon as he resumed the hostile character of a Barbarian. The vineyards and fruitful fields, between the rapid Marsyas and the winding Mæander,[4] were consumed with fire; the decayed walls of the cities crumbled into dust, at the first stroke of an enemy; the trembling inhabitants escaped from a bloody massacre to the shores of the Hellespont; and a considerable part of Asia Minor was desolated by the rebellion of Tribigild. His rapid progress was checked by the resistance of the peasants of Pamphylia; and the Ostrogoths, attacked in a narrow pass, between the city of Selgæ,[5] a deep morass, and the craggy clifts of Mount Taurus, were defeated with the loss of their bravest troops. But the spirit of their chief was not daunted by misfortune; and his army was continually recruited by swarms of Barbarians and outlaws, who were desirous of exercising the profession of robbery, under the more honourable names of war and conquest. The rumours of the success of Tribigild might for some time be suppressed by fear, or disguised by flattery; yet they gradually alarmed both the court and the capital. Every misfortune was exaggerated in dark and doubtful hints; and the future designs of the rebels became the subject of anxious conjecture. Whenever

[1] Godefroy, iii. 89. It is, however, suspected that this law, so repugnant to the maxims of Germanic freedom, has been surreptitiously added to the golden bull.

[2] A copious and circumstantial narrative (which he might have reserved for more important events) is bestowed by Zos. (l. v. 304.) on the revolt of Tribigild and Gainas. Socr. l. vi. c. 6. and Soz. l. viii. c. 4. The second book of Claudian against Eutropius, is a fine, though imperfect, piece of history.

[3] Claud. (in Eutrop. l. ii. 237.) very accurately observes, that the ancient name and nation of the Phrygians extended very far on every side, till their limits were contracted by the colonies of the Bithynians of Thrace, of the Greeks, and at last of the Gauls. His description (ii. 257.) of the fertility of Phrygia, and of the four rivers that produce gold, is just and picturesque.

[4] Xenop. Anab. l. i. p. 11, 12. ed. Hutchinson. Strabo, l. xii. 865. ed. Amstel. Q. Curt. l. iii. c. 1. Claudian compares the junction of the Marsyas and Mæander to that of the Saone and the Rhone; with this difference, however, that the smaller of the Phrygian rivers is not accelerated, but retarded, by the larger.

[5] Selgæ, a colony of the Lacedæmonians, had formerly numbered 20,000 citizens; but in the age of Zosimus it was reduced to a πολιχνη, or small town. Cellarius, Geog. Antiq. ii. 117.

Tribigild advanced into the inland country, the Romans were inclined to suppose that he meditated the passage of Mount Taurus, and the invasion of Syria. If he descended towards the sea, they imputed, and perhaps suggested, to the Gothic chief, the more dangerous project of arming a fleet in the harbours of Ionia, and of extending his depredations along the maritime coast, from the mouth of the Nile to the port of Constantinople. The approach of danger, and the obstinacy of Tribigild, who refused all terms of accommodation, compelled Eutropius to summon a council of war.[1] After claiming for himself the privilege of a veteran soldier, the eunuch entrusted the guard of Thrace and the Hellespont to Gainas the Goth; and the command of the Asiatic army to his favourite Leo; two generals, who differently, but effectually, promoted the cause of the rebels. Leo,[2] who, from the bulk of his body, and the dulness of his mind, was surnamed the Ajax of the East, had deserted his original trade of a woolcomber, to exercise, with much less skill and success, the military profession: and his uncertain operations were capriciously framed and executed, with an ignorance of real difficulties, and a timorous neglect of every favourable opportunity. The rashness of the Ostrogoths had drawn them into a disadvantageous position between the rivers Melas and Eurymedon, where they were almost besieged by the peasants of Pamphylia; but the arrival of an Imperial army, instead of completing their destruction, afforded the means of safety and victory. Tribigild surprised the unguarded camp of the Romans, in the darkness of the night; seduced the faith of the greater part of the Barbarian auxiliaries, and dissipated, without much effort, the troops, which had been corrupted by the relaxation of discipline, and the luxury of the capital. The discontent of Gainas, who had so boldly contrived and executed the death of Rufinus, was irritated by the fortune of his unworthy successor; he accused his own dishonourable patience under the servile reign of an eunuch; and the ambitious Goth was convicted, at least in the public opinion, of secretly fomenting the revolt of Tribigild, with whom he was connected by a domestic, as well as by a national, alliance.[3] When Gainas passed the Hellespont, to unite under his standard the remains of the Asiatic troops, he skilfully adapted his motions to the wishes of the Ostrogoths; abandoning, by his retreat, the country which they desired to invade; or facilitating, by his approach, the desertion of the Barbarian auxiliaries. To the Imperial court he repeatedly magnified the valour, the genius, the inexhaustible resources of Tribigild; confessed his own inability to prosecute the war; and extorted the permission of negociating with his invincible adversary. The conditions of peace were dictated by the haughty rebel; and the

[1] The council of Eutropius, in Claudian, may be compared to that of Domitian in the fourth satire of Juvenal. The principal members of the former were, juvenes protervi lascivique senes: one of them had been a cook, a second a woolcomber. The language of their original profession exposes their assumed dignity; and their trifling conversation about tragedies, dancers, &c. is made still more ridiculous by the importance of the debate.

[2] Claud. (l. ii. 376.) has branded him with infamy; and Zos., in more temperate language, confirms his reproaches. L. v. 305.

[3] The *conspiracy* of Gainas and Tribigild, which is attested by the Greek historian, had not reached the ears of Claudian, who attributes the revolt of the Ostrogoth to his own *martial* spirit, and the advice of his wife.

peremptory demand of the head of Eutropius, revealed the author and the design of this hostile conspiracy.

The bold satirist, who (A.D. 399) has indulged his discontent by the partial and passionate censure of the Christian emperors, violates the dignity, rather than the truth, of history, by comparing the son of Theodosius to one of those harmless and simple animals, who scarcely feel that they are the property of their shepherd. Two passions, however, fear and conjugal affection, awakened the languid soul of Arcadius: he was terrified by the threats of a victorious Barbarian; and he yielded to the tender eloquence of his wife Eudoxia, who, with a flood of artificial tears, presenting her infant children to their father, implored his justice for some real or imaginary insult, which she imputed to the audacious eunuch.[1] The emperor's hand was directed to sign the condemnation of Eutropius; the magic spell, which during four years had bound the prince and the people, was instantly dissolved; and the acclamations, that so lately hailed the merit and fortune of the favourite, were converted into the clamours of the soldiers and people, who reproached his crimes, and pressed his immediate execution. In this hour of distress and despair, his only refuge was in the sanctuary of the church, whose privileges he had wisely, or profanely, attempted to circumscribe; and the most eloquent of the saints, John Chrysostom, enjoyed the triumph of protecting a prostrate minister, whose choice had raised him to the ecclesiastical throne of Constantinople. The archbishop, ascending the pulpit of the cathedral, that he might be distinctly seen and heard by an innumerable crowd of either sex and of every age, pronounced a seasonable and pathetic discourse on the forgiveness of injuries, and the instability of human greatness. The agonies of the pale and affrighted wretch, who lay grovelling under the table of the altar, exhibited a solemn and instructive spectacle; and the orator, who was afterwards accused of insulting the misfortunes of Eutropius, laboured to excite the contempt, that he might assuage the fury, of the people.[2] The powers of humanity, of superstition, and of eloquence, prevailed. The empress Eudoxia was restrained, by her own prejudices, or by those of her subjects, from violating the sanctuary of the church; and Eutropius was tempted to capitulate, by the milder arts of persuasion, and by an oath, that his life should be spared.[3] Careless of the dignity of their sovereign, the

[1] This anecdote, which Philostorgius alone has preserved (l. xi. c. 6. and Gothofred. Dissertat. p. 451.), is curious and important; since it connects the revolt of the Goths with the secret intrigues of the palace.

[2] Homily of Chrysost. iii. 381. of which the exordium is particularly beautiful. Socr. l. vi. c. 5. Soz. l. viii. c. 7. Montfaucon (Life of Chrysost. xiii. 135.) too hastily supposes that Tribigild was *actually* in Constantinople; and that he commanded the soldiers who were ordered to seize Eutropius. Even Claudian, a Pagan poet (Præfat. ad l. ii. in Eutrop. 27.), has mentioned the flight of the eunuch to the sanctuary.

Suppliciterque pias humilis prostratus ad aras Mitigat iratas voce tremente nurus.

[3] Chrysostom, in another homily (iii. 386.), affects to declare, that Eutropius would not have been taken, had he not deserted the church. Zos. (l. v. 313.), on the contrary, pretends, that his enemies forced him (εξαρπασαντες αυτον) from the sanctuary. Yet the promise is an evidence of some treaty; and the strong assurance of Claud. (Præfat. ad l. ii. 46.),

Sed tamen exemplo non feriere tuo,

may be considered as an evidence of some promise.

new ministers of the palace immediately published an edict, to declare, that his late favourite had disgraced the names of consul and patrician, to abolish his statues, to confiscate his wealth, and to inflict a perpetual exile in the island of Cyprus.[1] A despicable and decrepit eunuch could no long alarm the fears of his enemies ; nor was he capable of enjoying what yet remained, the comforts of peace, of solitude, and of a happy climate. But their implacable revenge still envied him the last moments of a miserable life, and Eutropius had no sooner touched the shores of Cyprus, than he was hastily recalled. The vain hope of eluding, by a change of place, the obligation of an oath, engaged the empress to transfer the scene of his trial and execution, from Constantinople to the adjacent suburb of Chalcedon. The consul Aurelian pronounced the sentence ; and the motives of that sentence expose the jurisprudence of a despotic government. The crimes which Eutropius had committed against the people, might have justified his death ; but he was found guilty of harnessing to his chariot the *sacred* animals, who, from their breed, or colour, were reserved for the use of the emperor alone.—*Zos.* l. v. 313. *Philostorg.* l. xi. c. 6.

While this domestic revolution was transacted, Gainas[2] (A.D. 400) openly revolted from his allegiance ; united his forces, at Thyatira in Lydia, with those of Tribigild ; and still maintained his superior ascendant over the rebellious leader of the Ostrogoths. The confederate armies advanced, without resistance, to the Straits of the Hellespont, and the Bosphorus ; and Arcadius was instructed to prevent the loss of his Asiatic dominions, by resigning his authority and his person to the faith of the Barbarians. The church of the holy martyr Euphemia, situate on a lofty eminence near Chalcedon,[3] was chosen for the place of the interview. Gainas bowed, with reverence, at the feet of the emperor, whilst he required the sacrifice of Aurelian and Saturninus, two ministers of consular rank ; and their naked necks were exposed, by the haughty rebel, to the edge of the sword, till he condescended to grant them a precarious and disgraceful respite. The Goths, according to the terms of the agreement, were immediately transported from Asia into Europe ; and their victorious chief, who accepted the title of master-general of the Roman armies, soon filled Constantinople with his troops, and distributed among his dependents the honours and rewards of the empire. In his early youth, Gainas had passed the Danube as a suppliant and a fugitive : his elevation had been the work of valour and fortune ; and his indiscreet, or perfidious, conduct, was the cause of his rapid downfall. Notwithstanding the vigorous opposition of the archbishop, he importunately claimed, for his Arian sectaries, the possession of a peculiar church ; and the pride of the

[1] Cod. Theod. l. ix. tit. xl. leg. 14. The date of that law (Jan. 17, A.D. 399.) is erroneous and corrupt : since the fall of Eutropius could not happen till the autumn of the same year. Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. v. 780.

[2] Zosimus (l. v. p. 313—323.), Socrates (l. vi. c. 4.), Sozomen (l. viii. c. 4.), and Theodoret (l. v. c. 32, 33.), represent, though with some various circumstances, the conspiracy, defeat, and death of Gainas.

[3] Οσιας Ευφημιας μαρτυριον, is the expression of Zosimus himself (l. v. 314.), who inadvertently uses the fashionable language of the Christians. Evag. describes (l. ii. c. iii.) the situation, architecture, relics, and miracles of that celebrated church, in which the general council of Chalcedon was afterwards held.

Catholics was offended by the public toleration of heresy.[1] Every quarter of Constantinople was filled with tumult and disorder; and the Barbarians gazed with such ardour on the rich shops of the jewellers, and the tables of the bankers, which were covered with gold and silver, that it was judged prudent to remove those dangerous temptations from their sight. They resented the injurious precaution; and some alarming attempts were made (July 20) during the night to attack and destroy with fire the Imperial palace.[2] In this state of mutual and suspicious hostility, the guards, and the people of Constantinople, shut the gates, and rose in arms to prevent, or to punish, the conspiracy of the Goths. During the absence of Gainas, his troops were surprised and oppressed; 7000 Barbarians perished in this bloody massacre. In the fury of the pursuit, the Catholics uncovered the roof, and continued to throw down flaming logs of wood, till they overwhelmed their adversaries, who had retreated to the church or conventicle of the Arians. Gainas was either innocent of the design, or too confident of his success; he was astonished by the intelligence, that the flower of his army had been ingloriously destroyed; that he himself was declared a public enemy; and that his countryman, Fravitta, a brave and loyal confederate, had assumed the management of the war by sea and land. The enterprises of the rebel, against the cities of Thrace, were encountered by a firm and well-ordered defence: his hungry soldiers were soon reduced to the grass that grew on the margin of the fortifications; and Gainas, who vainly regretted the wealth and luxury of Asia, embraced a desperate resolution of forcing the passage of the Hellespont. He was destitute of vessels; but the woods of the Chersonesus afforded materials for rafts, and his intrepid Barbarians did not refuse (Dec. 23) to trust themselves to the waves. But Fravitta attentively watched the progress of their undertaking. As soon as they had gained the middle of the stream, the Roman gallies,[3] impelled by the full force of oars, of the current, and of a favourable wind, rushed forwards in compact order, and with irresistible weight; and the Hellespont was covered with the fragments of the Gothic shipwreck. After the destruction of his hopes, and the loss of many thousands of his bravest soldiers, Gainas, who could no longer aspire to govern, or to subdue, the Romans, determined to resume the independence of a savage life. A light and active body of Barbarian horse, disengaged from their infantry and baggage, might perform, in eight or ten days, a march of 300 miles from the Hellespont to the Danube;[4]

[1] The pious remonstrances of Chrysostom, which do not appear in his own writings, are strongly urged by Theodoret; but his insinuation, that they were successful, is disproved by facts. Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 383.) has discovered, that the emperor, to satisfy the rapacious demands of Gainas, was obliged to melt the plate of the church of the Apostles.

[2] The ecclesiastical historians, who sometimes guide, and sometimes follow, the public opinion, most confidently assert that the palace of Constantinople was guarded by legions of angels.

[3] Zos. (l. v. p. 319.) mentions these gallies, by the name of *Liburnians*, and observes, that they were as swift (without explaining the difference between them) as the vessels with fifty oars; but that they were far inferior in speed to the *triremes*, which had been long disused. Yet he reasonably concludes, from the testimony of Polybius, that gallies of a still larger size had been constructed in the Punic wars. Since the establishment of the Roman empire over the Mediterranean, the useless art of building large ships of war had probably been neglected and at length forgotten.

[4] Chishull (Travels, p. 61—63. 72—76.) proceeded from Gallipoli, through Hadrianople, to

the garrisons of that important frontier had been gradually annihilated; the river, in the month of December, would be deeply frozen; and the unbounded prospect of Scythia was open to the ambition of Gainas. This design was secretly communicated to the national troops, who devoted themselves to the fortunes of their leader; and before the signal of departure was given, a great number of provincial auxiliaries, whom he suspected of an attachment to their native country, were perfidiously massacred. The Goths advanced, by rapid marches, through the plains of Thrace; and they were soon delivered from the fear of a pursuit, by the vanity of Fravitta, who, instead of extinguishing the war, hastened to enjoy the popular applause, and to assume the peaceful honours of the consulship. But a formidable ally appeared in arms to vindicate the majesty of the empire, and to guard the peace and liberty of Scythia.[1] The superior forces of Uldin, king of the Huns, opposed the progress of Gainas; an hostile and ruined country prohibited his retreat; he disdained to capitulate; and after repeatedly attempting to cut his way through the ranks of the enemy, he was slain (A.D. 401. January 3), with his desperate followers, in the field of battle. Eleven days after the naval victory of the Hellespont, the head of Gainas, the inestimable gift of the conqueror, was received at Constantinople with the most liberal expressions of gratitude; and the public deliverance was celebrated by festivals and illuminations. The triumphs of Arcadius became the subject of epic poems;[2] and the monarch, no longer oppressed by any hostile terrors, resigned himself to the mild and absolute dominion of his wife, the fair and artful Eudoxia; who has sullied her fame by the persecution of St. John Chrysostom.

After the death (A.D. 398. Feb. 26) of the indolent Nectarius, the successor of Gregory Nazianzen, the church of Constantinople was distracted by the ambition of rival candidates, who were not ashamed to solicit, with gold or flattery, the suffrage of the people, or of the favourite. On this occasion, Eutropius seems to have deviated from his ordinary maxims; and his uncorrupted judgment was determined only by the superior merit of a stranger. In a late journey into the East, he had admired the sermons of John, a native and presbyter of Antioch, whose name has been distinguished by the epithet of Chrysostom, or the Golden Mouth.[3] A private order was dispatched to the

the Danube, in about 15 days. He was in the train of an English ambassador, whose baggage consisted of 71 waggons. That learned traveller has the merit of tracing a curious and unfrequented route.

[1] The narrative of Zosimus, who actually leads Gainas beyond the Danube, must be corrected by the testimony of Socrates, and Sozomen, that he was killed in *Thrace;* and by the precise and authentic dates of the Alexandrian, or Paschal, Chronicle, p. 307. The naval victory of the Hellespont is fixed to the month Apellæus, the tenth of the calends of January (Dec. 23.); the head of Gainas was brought to Constantinople the third of the nones of January (Jan. 3.), in the month Audynæus.

[2] Eusebius Scholasticus acquired much fame by his poem on the Gothic war, in which he had served. Near forty years afterwards, Ammonius recited another poem on the same subject, in the presence of the emperor Theodosius. Socrates, l. vi. c. 6.

[3] The sixth book of Socrates, the eighth of Sozomen, and the fifth of Theodoret, afford curious and authentic materials for the life of John Chrysostom. Besides those general historians, I have taken for my guides the four principal biographers of the saint. 1. The author of a partial and passionate Vindication of the Archbishop of Constantinople, composed in the form of a dialogue, and under the name of his zealous partizan, Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis (Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xi. 500.). It is inserted among the works of Chrysostom, xiii. p.

governor of Syria; and as the people might be unwilling to resign their favourite preacher, he was transported, with speed and secrecy, in a post-chariot, from Antioch to Constantinople. The unanimous and unsolicited consent of the court, the clergy, and the people, ratified the choice of the minister; and, both as a saint and as an orator, the new archbishop surpassed the sanguine expectations of the public. Born of a noble and opulent family, in the capital of Syria, Chrysostom had been educated by the care of a tender mother, under the tuition of the most skilful masters. He studied the art of rhetoric in the school of Libanius; and that celebrated sophist, who soon discovered the talents of his disciple, ingenuously confessed, that John would have deserved to succeed him, had he not been stolen away by the Christians. His piety soon disposed him to receive the sacrament of baptism; to renounce the lucrative and honourable profession of the law; and to bury himself in the adjacent desert, where he subdued the lusts of the flesh by an austere penance of six years. His infirmities compelled him to return to the society of mankind; and the authority of Meletius devoted his talents to the service of the church: but in the midst of his family, and afterwards on the archiepiscopal throne, Chrysostom still persevered in the practice of the monastic virtues. The ample revenues, which his predecessors had consumed in pomp and luxury, he diligently applied to the establishment of hospitals; and the multitudes, who were supported by his charity, preferred the eloquent and edifying discourses of their archbishop, to the amusements of the theatre, or the circus. The monuments of that eloquence, which was admired near twenty years at Antioch and Constantinople, have been carefully preserved; and the possession of near one thousand sermons, or homilies, has authorized the critics[1] of succeeding times to appreciate the genuine merit of Chrysostom. They unanimously attribute to the Christian orator, the free command of an elegant and copious language; the judgment to conceal the advantages which he derived from the knowledge of rhetoric and philosophy; an inexhaustible fund of metaphors and similitudes, of ideas and images, to vary and illustrate the most familiar topics; the happy art of engaging the passions in the service of virtue; and of exposing the folly, as well as the turpitude, of vice, almost with the truth and spirit of a dramatic representation.

The pastoral labours of the archbishop of Constantinople provoked, and gradually united against him, two sorts of enemies; the aspiring clergy, who envied his success, and the obstinate sinners, who were offended by his reproofs (A.D. 398—403). When Chrysostom

1—90. ed. Montfaucon. 2. The moderate Erasmus (iii. epist. MCL. p. 1331. ed. Ludg. Bat.). His vivacity and good sense were his own; his errors, in the uncultivated state of ecclesiastical antiquity, were almost inevitable. 3. The learned Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. xi. 1—405. 547—626. &c.); who compiles the lives of the saints with incredible patience, and religious accuracy. He has minutely searched the voluminous works of Chrysostom himself. 4. Father Montfaucon; who has perused those works with the curious diligence of an editor, discovered several new homilies, and again reviewed and composed the Life of Chrysostom (Opera Chrysost. xiii. 91—177.).

[1] As I am *almost* a stranger to the voluminous sermons of Chrysostom, I have given my confidence to the two most judicious and moderate of the ecclesiastical critics, Erasmus (iii. 1344.), and Dupin (Biblio. Eccles. iii. 38.): yet the good taste of the former is sometimes vitiated by an excessive love of antiquity; and the good sense of the latter is always restrained by prudential considerations.

thundered, from the pulpit of St. Sophia, against the degeneracy of the Christians, his shafts were spent among the crowd, without wounding, or even marking, the character of any individual. When he declaimed against the peculiar vices of the rich, poverty might obtain a transient consolation from his invectives: but the guilty were still sheltered by their numbers; and the reproach itself was dignified by some ideas of superiority, and enjoyment. But as the pyramid rose towards the summit, it insensibly diminished to a point; and the magistrates, the ministers, the favourite eunuchs, the ladies of the court,[1] the empress Eudoxia herself, had a much larger share of guilt, to divide among a smaller proportion of criminals. The personal applications of the audience were anticipated, or confirmed, by the testimony of their own conscience; and the intrepid preacher assumed the dangerous right of exposing both the offence, and the offender, to the public abhorrence. The secret resentment of the court encouraged the discontent of the clergy and monks of Constantinople, who were too hastily reformed by the fervent zeal of their archbishop. He had condemned, from the pulpit, the domestic females of the clergy of Constantinople, who, under the name of servants, or sisters, afforded a perpetual occasion either of sin, or of scandal. The silent and solitary ascetics, who had secluded themselves from the world, were intitled to the warmest approbation of Chrysostom; but he despised and stigmatized, as the disgrace of their holy profession, the crowd of degenerate monks, who, from some unworthy motives of pleasure or profit, so frequently infested the streets of the capital. To the voice of persuasion, the archbishop was obliged to add the terrors of authority; and his ardour, in the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, was not always exempt from passion; nor was it always guided by prudence. Chrysostom was naturally of a choleric disposition.[2] Although he struggled, according to the precepts of the gospel, to love his private enemies, he indulged himself in the privilege of hating the enemies of God, and of the church; and his sentiments were sometimes delivered with too much energy of countenance and expression. He still maintained, from some considerations of health, or abstinence, his former habits of taking his repasts alone; and this inhospitable custom,[3] which his enemies imputed to pride, contributed, at least, to nourish the infirmity of a morose and unsocial humour. Separated from that familiar intercourse, which facilitates the knowledge and the dispatch of business, he reposed an unsus-

[1] The females of Constantinople distinguished themselves by their enmity or their attachment to Chrysostom. Three noble and opulent widows, Marsa, Castricia, and Eugraphia, were the leaders of the persecution (Pallad. Dialog. xiii. 14.). It was impossible that they should forgive a preacher, who reproached their affectation to conceal, by the ornaments of dress, their age and ugliness (Pallad. p. 27.). Olympias, by equal zeal, displayed in a more pious cause, has obtained the title of saint. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xi. 416.

[2] Sozomen, and more especially Socrates, have defined the real character of Chrysostom with a temperate and impartial freedom, very offensive to his blind admirers. Those historians lived in the next generation, when party violence was abated, and had conversed with many persons intimately acquainted with the virtues and imperfections of the saint.

[3] Pallad. (xiii. 40.) very seriously defends the archbishop. 1. He never tasted wine. 2. The weakness of his stomach required a peculiar diet. 3. Business, or study, or devotion, often kept him fasting till sunset. 4. He detested the noise and levity of great dinners. 5. He saved the expence for the use of the poor. 6. He was apprehensive, in a capital like Constantinople, of the envy and reproach of partial invitations.

pecting confidence in his deacon Serapion; and seldom applied his speculative knowledge of human nature to the particular characters, either of his dependents, or of his equals. Conscious of the purity of his intentions, and perhaps of the superiority of his genius, the archbishop of Constantinople extended the jurisdiction of the Imperial city, that he might enlarge the sphere of his pastoral labours; and the conduct which the profane imputed to an ambitious motive, appeared to Chrysostom himself in the light of a sacred and indispensable duty. In his visitation through the Asiatic provinces, he deposed thirteen bishops of Lydia and Phrygia; and indiscreetly declared, that a deep corruption of simony and licentiousness had infected the whole episcopal order.[1] If those bishops were innocent, such a rash and unjust condemnation must excite a well-grounded discontent. If they were guilty, the numerous associates of their guilt would soon discover, that their own safety depended on the ruin of the archbishop; whom they studied to represent as the tyrant of the Eastern church.

This ecclesiastical conspiracy was managed by Theophilus (*Tillemont, Mem. Eccles.* xi. 441—500), archbishop of Alexandria, an active and ambitious prelate, who displayed the fruits of rapine in monuments of ostentation. His national dislike to the rising greatness of a city, which degraded him from the second to the third rank in the Christian world, was exasperated by some personal disputes with Chrysostom himself.[2] By the private invitation of the empress, Theophilus landed (A.D. 403) at Constantinople, with a stout body of Egyptian mariners, to encounter the populace; and a train of dependent bishops, to secure, by their voices, the majority of a synod. The synod[3] was convened in the suburb of Chalcedon, surnamed the *Oak*, where Rufinus had erected a stately church and monastery; and their proceedings were continued during fourteen days or sessions. A bishop and a deacon accused the archbishop of Constantinople; but the frivolous or improbable nature of the forty-seven articles which they presented against him, may justly be considered as a fair and unexceptionable panegyric. Four successive summons were signified to Chrysostom; but he still refused to trust either his person, or his reputation, in the hands of his implacable enemies, who prudently declining the examination of any particular charges, condemned his contumacious disobedience, and hastily pronounced a sentence of deposition. The synod of the *Oak* immediately addressed the emperor to ratify and execute their judgment, and charitably insinuated, that the penalties of treason might be inflicted on the audacious preacher, who had reviled, under the name of Jezebel, the empress Eudoxia herself.

[1] Chrysostom declares his free opinion (ix. hom. iii. in Act. Apostol. p. 29.), that the number of bishops who might be saved, bore a very small proportion to those who would be damned.

[2] I have purposely omitted the controversy which arose among the monks of Egypt, concerning Origenism and Anthropomorphism: the dissimulation and violence of Theophilus; his artful management of the simplicity of Epiphanius; the persecution and flight of the *long*, or tall, brothers; the ambiguous support which they received at Constantinople from Chrysostom, &c.

[3] Photius (p. 53.) has preserved the original acts of the synod of the Oak; which destroy the false assertion, that Chrysostom was condemned by no more than 36 bishops, of whom 29 were Egyptians. Forty-five bishops subscribed his sentence. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xi. 595.

The archbishop was rudely arrested, and conducted through the city, by one of the Imperial messengers, who landed him, after a short navigation, near the entrance of the Euxine; from whence, before the expiration of two days, he was gloriously recalled.

The first astonishment of his faithful people had been mute and passive: they suddenly rose with unanimous and irresistible fury. Theophilus escaped; but the promiscuous crowd of monks and Egyptian mariners was slaughtered without pity in the streets of Constantinople.[1] A seasonable earthquake justified the interposition of heaven; the torrent of sedition rolled forwards to the gates of the palace; and the empress, agitated by fear, or remorse, threw herself at the feet of Arcadius, and confessed, that the public safety could be purchased only by the restoration of Chrysostom. The Bosphorus was covered with innumerable vessels; the shores of Europe and Asia were profusely illuminated; and the acclamations of a victorious people accompanied, from the port to the cathedral, the triumph of the archbishop; who, too easily, consented to resume the exercise of his functions, before his sentence had been legally reversed by the authority of an ecclesiastical synod. Ignorant, or careless, of the impending danger, Chrysostom indulged his zeal, or perhaps his resentment; declaimed with peculiar asperity against *female* vices; and condemned the profane honours which were addressed, almost in the precincts of St. Sophia, to the statue of the empress. His imprudence tempted his enemies to inflame the haughty spirit of Eudoxia, by reporting, or perhaps inventing, the famous exordium of a sermon, "Herodias is again furious; Herodias again dances; she once more "requires the head of John:" an insolent allusion, which, as a woman and a sovereign, it was impossible for her to forgive.[2] The short interval of a perfidious truce was employed to concert more effectual measures for the disgrace and ruin of the archbishop. A numerous council of the Eastern prelates, who were guided from a distance by the advice of Theophilus, confirmed the validity, without examining the justice, of the former sentence; and a detachment of Barbarian troops was introduced into the city, to suppress the emotions of the people. On the vigil of Easter, the solemn administration of baptism was rudely interrupted by the soldiers, who alarmed the modesty of the naked catechumens, and violated, by their presence, the awful mysteries of the Christian worship. Arsacius occupied the church of St. Sophia, and the archiepiscopal throne. The Catholics retreated to the baths of Constantine, and afterwards to the fields; where they were still pursued and insulted by the guards, the bishops, and the magistrates. The fatal day of the second and final exile of Chrysostom was marked by the conflagration of the cathedral, of the senate-house, and of the adjacent buildings; and this calamity was imputed, without

[1] Palladius owns (p. 30.), that if the people of Constantinople had found Theophilus, they would certainly have thrown him into the sea. Socrates mentions (l. vi. c. 17.) a battle between the mob and the sailors of Alexandria, in which many wounds were given, and some lives were lost. The massacre of the monks is observed only by the Pagan Zos. (l. v. 324.), who acknowledges that Chrysostom had a singular talent to lead the illiterate multitude, ην γαρ ο ανθρωπος αλογον ὄχλον υπαγαγεσθαι δεινος.

[2] Socr. l. vi. c. 18. Soz. l. viii. c. 20. Zos. (l. v. 324.) mentions, in general terms, his invectives against Eudoxia. The homily which begins with those famous words is rejected as spurious. Montfaucon, xiii. 151. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xi. 603.

proof, but not without probability, to the despair of a persecuted faction.[1]

Cicero might claim some merit, if his voluntary banishment preserved the peace of the republic;[2] but the submission of Chrysostom was the indispensable duty of a Christian and a subject. Instead of listening to his humble prayer, that he might be permitted to reside at Cyzicus, or Nicomedia, the inflexible empress assigned (A.D. 404. June 20) for his exile the remote and desolate town of Cucusus, among the ridges of Mount Taurus, in the Lesser Armenia. A secret hope was entertained, that the archbishop might perish in a difficult and dangerous march of seventy days in the heat of summer, through the provinces of Asia Minor, where he was continually threatened by the hostile attacks of the Isaurians, and the more implacable fury of the monks. Yet Chrysostom arrived in safety at the place of his confinement; and the three years, which he spent at Cucusus, and the neighbouring town of Arabissus, were the last and most glorious of his life. His character was consecrated by absence and persecution; the faults of his administration were no longer remembered; but every tongue repeated the praises of his genius and virtue: and the respectful attention of the Christian world was fixed on a desert spot among the mountains of Taurus. From that solitude, the archbishop, whose active mind was invigorated by misfortunes, maintained a strict and frequent correspondence[3] with the most distant provinces; exhorted the separate congregation of his faithful adherents to persevere in their allegiance; urged the destruction of the temples of Phœnicia, and the extirpation of heresy in the isle of Cyprus; extended his pastoral care to the missions of Persia and Scythia; negociated, by his ambassadors, with the Roman pontiff, and the emperor Honorius; and boldly appealed, from a partial synod, to the supreme tribunal of a free and general council. The mind of the illustrious exile was still independent; but his captive body was exposed to the revenge of the oppressors, who continued to abuse the name and authority of Arcadius.[4] An order was dispatched for the instant removal of Chrysostom to the extreme desert of Pityus; and his guards so faithfully obeyed their cruel instructions, that, before he reached the sea-coast of the Euxine, he expired (A.D. 407, Sept. 14) at Comana, in Pontus, in the sixtieth year of his age. The succeeding generation acknowledged his innocence and merit. The archbishops of the East, who might blush

[1] We might naturally expect such a charge from Zos. (l. v. 327.); but it is remarkable enough, that it should be confirmed by Socr. l. vi. c. 18. and the Paschal Chronicle, p. 307.

[2] He displays those specious motives (Post Reditum, c. 13, 14.) in the language of an orator and a politician.

[3] Two hundred and forty-two of the epistles of Chrysostom are still extant (Opera, iii. 528—736.). They are addressed to a great variety of persons, and show a firmness of mind, much superior to that of Cicero in his exile. The fourteenth epistle contains a curious narrative of the dangers of his journey.

[4] After the exile of Chrysostom, Theophilus published an *enormous* and *horrible* volume against him, in which he perpetually repeats the polite expressions of hostem humanitatis, sacrilegorum principem, immundum dæmonem; he affirms, that John Chrysostom had delivered his soul to be adulterated by the devil; and wishes that some farther punishment, adequate (if possible) to the magnitude of his crimes, may be inflicted on him. St. Jerom, at the request of his friend Theophilus, translated this edifying performance from Greek into Latin. Facundus Hermian. Defens. pro iii. Capitul. l. vi. c. 5. published by Sirmond. Opera, ii. 595.

that their predecessors had been the enemies of Chrysostom, were gradually disposed, by the firmness of the Roman pontiff, to restore the honours of that venerable name.[1] At the pious solicitation of the clergy and people of Constantinople, his relics, thirty years after his death, were (A.D. 438. Jan. 27.) transported from their obscure sepulchre to the royal city.[2] The emperor Theodosius advanced to receive them as far as Chalcedon; and, falling prostrate on the coffin, implored, in the name of his guilty parents, Arcadius and Eudoxia, the forgiveness of the injured saint.[3]

Yet a reasonable doubt may be entertained, whether any stain of hereditary guilt could be derived from Arcadius to his successor. Eudoxia was a young and beautiful woman, who indulged her passions, and despised her husband: Count John enjoyed, at least, the familiar confidence of the empress; and the public named him as the real father of Theodosius the younger.[4] The birth of a son was accepted, however, by the pious husband, as an event the most fortunate and honourable to himself, to his family, and to the eastern world: and the royal infant, by an unprecedented favour, was invested with the titles of Cæsar and Augustus. In less than four years afterwards (A.D. 408. May 1), Eudoxia, in the bloom of youth, was destroyed by the consequences of a miscarriage; and this untimely death confounded the prophecy of a holy bishop,[5] who, amidst the universal joy, had ventured to foretell that she should behold the long and auspicious reign of her glorious son. The Catholics applauded the justice of heaven, which avenged the persecution of St. Chrysostom; and perhaps the emperor was the only person who sincerely bewailed the loss of the haughty and rapacious Eudoxia. Such a domestic misfortune afflicted *him* more deeply than the public calamities of the East (*Philostorg.* l. xi. c. 8. *Godefroy*, p. 457); the licentious excursions, from Pontus to Palestine, of the Isaurian robbers, whose impunity accused the weakness of the government; and the earthquakes, the conflagrations, the famine, and the flights of locusts,[6] which the popular discontent was equally disposed to attribute to the incapacity of the

[1] His name was inserted by his successor Atticus in the Dyptics of the church of Constantinople, A.D. 418. Ten years afterwards he was revered as a saint. Cyril, who inherited the place, and the passions, of his uncle Theophilus, yielded with much reluctance. Facund. Hermian. l. iv. c. 1. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xiv. 277.

[2] Socr. l. vii. c. 45. Theodor. l. v. c. 36. This event reconciled the Joannites, who had hitherto refused to acknowledge his successors. During his lifetime, the Joannites were respected by the Catholics, as the true and orthodox communion of Constantinople. Their obstinacy gradually drove them to the brink of schism.

[3] According to some accounts (Baronius, Annal. Eccles. A.D. 438. No. 9, 10.), the emperor was forced to send a letter of invitation and excuses, before the body of the ceremonious saint could be moved from Comana.

[4] Zos. l. v. 315. The chastity of an empress should not be impeached without producing a witness; but it is astonishing, that the witness should write and live under a prince, whose legitimacy he dared to attack. We must suppose that his history was a party libel, privately read and circulated by the Pagans. Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. v. 782.) is not averse to brand the reputation of Eudoxia.

[5] Porphyry of Gaza. His zeal was transported by the order which he had obtained for the destruction of eight Pagan temples of that city. See the curious details of his life (Baronius, A.D. 401. No. 17—51.) originally written in Greek, or perhaps in Syriac, by a monk, one of his favourite deacons.

[6] Jerom (vi. 73.) describes, in lively colours, the regular and destructive march of the locusts, which spread a dark cloud, between heaven and earth, over the land of Palestine. Seasonable winds scattered them, partly into the Dead Sea, and partly into the Mediterranean.

monarch. At length, in the thirty-first year of his age, after a reign (if we may abuse that word) of thirteen years three months and fifteen days, Arcadius expired in the palace of Constantinople. It is impossible to delineate his character; since, in a period very copiously furnished with historical materials, it has not been possible to remark one action that properly belongs to the son of the great Theodosius.

The historian Procopius (*de Bell. Persic.* l. i. c. 2. p. 8) has indeed illuminated the mind of the dying emperor with a ray of human prudence or celestial wisdom. Arcadius considered, with anxious foresight, the helpless condition of his son Theodosius, who was no more than seven years of age, the dangerous factions of a minority, and the aspiring spirit of Jezdegerd, the Persian monarch. Instead of tempting the allegiance of an ambitious subject, by the participation of supreme power, he boldly appealed to the magnanimity of a king; and placed, by a solemn testament, the sceptre of the East in the hands of Jezdegerd himself. The royal guardian accepted and discharged this honourable trust with unexampled fidelity; and the infancy of Theodosius was protected by the arms and councils of Persia. Such is the singular narrative of Procopius; and his veracity is not disputed by Agathias,[1] while he presumes to dissent from his judgment, and to arraign the wisdom of a Christian emperor, who so rashly, though so fortunately, committed his son and his dominions to the unknown faith of a stranger, a rival, and a heathen. At the distance of 150 years, this political question might be debated in the court of Justinian; but a prudent historian will refuse to examine the *propriety*, till he has ascertained the *truth*, of the testament of Arcadius. As it stands without a parallel in the history of the world, we may justly require, that it should be attested by the positive and unanimous evidence of contemporaries. The strange novelty of the event, which excites our distrust, must have attracted their notice; and their universal silence annihilates the vain tradition of the succeeding age.

The maxims of Roman jurisprudence, if they could fairly be transferred from private property to public dominion, would have adjudged to the emperor Honorius the guardianship of his nephew, till he had attained, at least, the fourteenth year of his age. But the weakness of Honorius, and the calamities of his reign, disqualified him from prosecuting this natural claim; and such was the absolute separation of the two monarchies, both in interest and affection, that Constantinople would have obeyed, with less reluctance, the orders of the Persian, than those of the Italian, court. Under a prince, whose weakness is disguised by the external signs of manhood and discretion, the most worthless favourites may secretly dispute the empire of the palace; and dictate to submissive provinces, the commands of a master, whom they direct and despise. But the ministers of a child, who is incapable of arming them with the sanction of the royal name, must acquire and exercise an independent authority. The great officers of the state and army, who had been appointed before the death of Arcadius, formed

[1] Agath. l. iv. 136. Although he confesses the prevalence of the tradition, he asserts, that Procopius was the first who had committed it to writing. Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. vi. 597.) argues very sensibly on the merits of this fable. His criticism was not warped by any ecclesiastical authority: both Procopius and Agathias are half Pagans.

an aristocracy, which might have inspired them with the idea of a free republic; and the government of the eastern empire was fortunately assumed (A.D. 408—415) by the præfect Anthemius,[1] who obtained, by his superior abilities, a lasting ascendant over the minds of his equals. The safety of the young emperor proved the merit and integrity of Anthemius; and his prudent firmness sustained the force and reputation of an infant reign. Uldin, with a formidable host of Barbarians, was encamped in the heart of Thrace: he proudly rejected all terms of accommodation; and, pointing to the rising sun, declared to the Roman ambassadors, that the course of that planet should alone terminate the conquests of the Huns. But the desertion of his confederates, who were privately convinced of the justice and liberality of the Imperial ministers, obliged Uldin to repass the Danube: the tribe of the Scyrri, which composed his rearguard, was almost extirpated; and many thousand captives were dispersed to cultivate, with servile labour, the fields of Asia.[2] In the midst of the public triumph, Constantinople was protected by a strong inclosure of new and more extensive walls; the same vigilant care was applied to restore the fortifications of the Illyrian cities: and a plan was judiciously conceived, which, in the space of seven years, would have secured the command of the Danube, by establishing on that river a perpetual fleet of 250 armed vessels.[3]

But the Romans had so long been accustomed to the authority of a monarch, that the first, even among the females, of the Imperial family, who displayed any courage or capacity, was permitted to ascend the vacant throne of Theodosius. His sister Pulcheria,[4] who was only two years older than himself, received, at the age of sixteen, the title of *Augusta;* and though her favour might be sometimes clouded by caprice or intrigue, she continued to govern the Eastern empire near forty years (A.D. 414—453); during the long minority of her brother, and after his death, in her own name, and in the name of Marcian, her nominal husband. From a motive, either of prudence or religion, she embraced a life of celibacy; and notwithstanding some aspersions on the chastity of Pulcheria, this resolution, which she communicated to her sisters Arcadia and Marina, was celebrated by the Christian world, as the sublime effort of heroic piety. In the presence of the clergy and people, the three daughters of Arcadius[5] dedicated their virginity to God; and the obligation of their solemn vow was inscribed on a tablet of gold and gems; which they publicly offered in the great church of Constantinople. Their palace was con-

[1] Socr. l. vii. c. 1. Anthemius was the grandson of Philip, one of the ministers of Constantius, and the grandfather of the emperor Anthemius. After his return from the Persian embassy, he was appointed consul and Prætorian præfect of the East, in the year 405; and held the præfecture about ten years. Godefroy, Cod. Theod. vi. 350. Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. vi. 1, &c.

[2] Soz. l. ix. c. 5. He saw some Scyrri at work near Mount Olympus, in Bithynia, and cherished the vain hope that those captives were the last of the nation.

[3] Cod. Theod. l. vii. tit. xvii. l. xv. tit. i. leg. 49.

[4] Sozomen has filled three chapters with a magnificent panegyric of Pulcheria (l. ix. c. 1, 2, 3.); and Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. xv. 171.) has dedicated a separate article to the honour of St. Pulcheria, virgin, and empress.

[5] Ducange, Famil. Byzantin. p. 70. Flaccilla, the eldest daughter, either died before Arcadius, or, if *she* lived till the year 431 (Marcellin. Chron.), some defect of mind or body must have excluded her from the honours of her rank.

verted into a monastery; and all males, except the guides of their conscience, were scrupulously excluded from the holy threshold. Pulcheria, her two sisters, and a chosen train of favourite damsels, formed a religious community: they renounced the vanity of dress; interrupted, by frequent fasts, their simple and frugal diet; allotted a portion of their time to works of embroidery; and devoted several hours of the day and night to the exercises of prayer and psalmody. The piety of a Christian virgin was adorned by the zeal and liberality of an empress. Ecclesiastical history describes the splendid churches, which were built at the expence of Pulcheria, in all the provinces of the East; her charitable foundations for the benefit of strangers and the poor; the ample donations which she assigned for the perpetual maintenance of monastic societies; and the active severity with which she laboured to suppress the opposite heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches. Such virtues were supposed to deserve the peculiar favour of the Deity; and the relics of martyrs, as well as the knowledge of future events, were communicated in visions and revelations to the Imperial saint.[1] Yet the devotion of Pulcheria never diverted her indefatigable attention from temporal affairs; and she alone, among all the descendants of the great Theodosius, appears to have inherited any share of his manly spirit and abilities. The elegant and familiar use which she had acquired, both of the Greek and Latin languages, was readily applied to the various occasions of speaking, or writing, on public business: her deliberations were maturely weighed; her actions were prompt and decisive; and, while she moved without noise or ostentation the wheel of government, she discreetly attributed to the genius of the emperor, the long tranquillity of his reign. In the last years of his peaceful life, Europe was indeed afflicted by the arms of Attila; but the more extensive provinces of Asia still continued to enjoy a profound and permanent repose. Theodosius the younger was never reduced to the disgraceful necessity of encountering and punishing a rebellious subject: and since we cannot applaud the vigour, some praise may be due to the mildness, and prosperity, of the administration of Pulcheria.

The Roman world was deeply interested in the education of its master. A regular course of study and exercise was judiciously instituted; of the military exercises of riding, and shooting with the bow; of the liberal studies of grammar, rhetoric, and philosophy: the most skilful matters of the East ambitiously solicited the attention of their royal pupil; and several noble youths were introduced into the palace, to animate his diligence by the emulation of friendship. Pulcheria alone discharged the important task of instructing her brother in the arts of government; but her precepts may countenance some suspicion of the extent of her capacity, or of the purity of her intentions. She taught him to maintain a grave and majestic deportment; to

[1] She was admonished, by repeated dreams, of the place where the relics of the forty martyrs had been buried. The ground had successively belonged to the house and garden of a woman of Constantinople, to a monastery of Macedonian monks, and to a church of St Thyrsus, erected by Cæsarius, who was consul A.D. 397; and the memory of the relics was almost obliterated. Notwithstanding the charitable wishes of Jortin (Remarks, iv. 234.), it is not easy to acquit Pulcheria of some share in the pious fraud; which must have been transacted when she was more than five-and-thirty years of age.

walk, to hold his robes, to seat himself on his throne, in a manner worthy of a great prince; to abstain from laughter; to listen with condescension; to return suitable answers; to assume, by turns, a serious or a placid countenance; in a word, to represent with grace and dignity the external figure of a Roman emperor. But Theodosius [1] was never excited to support the weight and glory of an illustrious name; and, instead of aspiring to imitate his ancestors, he degenerated (if we may presume to measure the degrees of incapacity) below the weakness of his father and his uncle. Arcadius and Honorius had been assisted by the guardian care of a parent, whose lessons were enforced by his authority, and example. But the unfortunate prince, who is born in the purple, must remain a stranger to the voice of truth; and the son of Arcadius was condemned to pass his perpetual infancy, encompassed only by a servile train of women and eunuchs. The ample leisure, which he acquired by neglecting the essential duties of his high office, was filled by idle amusements, and unprofitable studies. Hunting was the only active pursuit that could tempt him beyond the limits of the palace; but he most assiduously laboured, sometimes by the light of a midnight lamp, in the mechanic occupations of painting and carving; and the elegance with which he transcribed religious books, entitled the Roman emperor to the singular epithet of *Calligraphes*, or a fair writer. Separated from the world by an impenetrable veil, Theodosius trusted the persons whom he loved; he loved those who were accustomed to amuse and flatter his indolence; and as he never perused the papers that were presented for the royal signature, the acts of injustice the most repugnant to his character, were frequently perpetrated in his name. The emperor himself was chaste, temperate, liberal, and merciful; but these qualities, which can only deserve the name of virtues, when they are supported by courage, and regulated by discretion, were seldom beneficial, and they sometimes proved mischievous, to mankind. His mind, enervated by a royal education, was oppressed, and degraded, by abject superstition: he fasted, he sung psalms, he blindly accepted the miracles and doctrines, with which his faith was continually nourished. Theodosius devoutly worshipped the dead and living saints of the Catholic church; and he once refused to eat, till an insolent monk, who had cast an excommunication on his sovereign, condescended to heal the spiritual wound which he had inflicted.[2]

The story of a fair and virtuous maiden exalted from a private condition to (A.D. 421—460) the Imperial throne, might be deemed an incredible romance, if such a romance had not been verified in the

[1] There is a remarkable difference between the two ecclesiastical historians, who in general bear so close a resemblance. Soz. (l. ix. c. 1.) ascribes to Pulcheria the government of the empire, and the education of her brother; whom he scarcely condescends to praise. Socrates, though he affectedly disclaims all hopes of favour or fame, composes an elaborate panegyric on the emperor, and cautiously suppresses the merits of his sister (l. vii. c. 22. 42.). Philostorg. (l. xii. c. 7.) expresses the influence of Pulcheria in gentle and courtly language, τας βασιλικας σημειωσεις υπηρετουμενη και διευθυνουσει. Suidas (Excerpt. p. 53.) gives a true character of Theodosius; and I have followed the example of Tillemont (vi. 25.), in borrowing some strokes from the modern Greeks.

[2] Theodor. l. v. c. 37. The bishop of Cyrrhus, one of the first men of his age for his learning and piety, applauds the obedience of Theodosius to the divine laws.

marriage of Theodosius. The celebrated Athenais[1] was educated by her father Leontius in the religion and sciences of the Greeks; and so advantageous was the opinion which the Athenian philosopher entertained of his contemporaries, that he divided his patrimony between his two sons, bequeathing to his daughter a small legacy of one hundred pieces of gold, in the lively confidence that her beauty and merit would be a sufficient portion. The jealousy and avarice of her brothers soon compelled Athenais to seek a refuge at Constantinople; and, with some hopes, either of justice, or favour, to throw herself at the feet of Pulcheria. That sagacious princess listened to her eloquent complaint; and secretly destined the daughter of the philosopher Leontius for the future wife of the emperor of the East, who had now attained the twentieth year of his age. She easily excited the curiosity of her brother, by an interesting picture of the charms of Athenais; large eyes, a well-proportioned nose, a fair complexion, golden locks, a slender person, a graceful demeanour, an understanding improved by study, and a virtue tried by distress. Theodosius, concealed behind a curtain in the apartment of his sister, was permitted to behold the Athenian virgin: the modest youth immediately declared his pure and honourable love; and the royal nuptials were celebrated amidst the acclamations of the capital and the provinces. Athenais, who was easily persuaded to renounce the errors of Paganism, received at her baptism the Christian name of Eudocia; but the cautious Pulcheria withheld the title of Augusta, till the wife of Theodosius had approved her fruitfulness by the birth of a daughter, who espoused, fifteen years afterwards, the emperor of the West. The brothers of Eudocia obeyed, with some anxiety, her Imperial summons; but, as she could easily forgive their fortunate unkindness, she indulged the tenderness, or perhaps the vanity, of a sister, by promoting them to the rank of consuls and præfects. In the luxury of the palace, she still cultivated those ingenious arts, which had contributed to her greatness; and wisely dedicated her talents to the honour of religion, and of her husband. Eudocia composed a poetical paraphrase of the first eight books of the Old Testament, and of the prophecies of Daniel and Zachariah; a cento of the verses of Homer, applied to the life and miracles of Christ, the legend of St. Cyprian, and a panegyric on the Persian victories of Theodosius: and her writings, which were applauded by a servile and superstitious age, have not been disdained by the candour of impartial criticism.[2] The fondness of the emperor was not abated by time; and Eudocia, after the marriage of her daughter, was per-

[1] Socr. (l. vii. c. 21.) mentions her name (Athenais, the daughter of Leontius, an Athenian sophist), her baptism, marriage, and poetical genius. The most ancient account of her history is in John Malala (part ii. 20. ed. 1743), and in the Paschal Chronicle (p. 311.). Those authors had probably seen original pictures of the empress Eudocia. The modern Greeks, Zonaras, Cedrenus, &c. have displayed the love, rather than the talent, of fiction. From Nicephorus, indeed, I have ventured to assume her age. The writer of a romance would not have *imagined*, that Athenais was near twenty-eight years old when she inflamed the heart of a young emperor.

[2] Socr. l. vii. c. 21. Photius, p. 413. The Homeric cento is still extant, and has been repeatedly printed; but the claim of Eudocia to that insipid performance is disputed by the critics. Fabricius, Biblio. Græc. i. 357. The *Ionia*, a miscellaneous dictionary of history and fable, was compiled by another empress of the name of Eudocia, who lived in the eleventh century; and the work is still extant in manuscript.

mitted to discharge her grateful vows by a solemn pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Her ostentatious progress through the East may seem inconsistent with the spirit of Christian humility: she pronounced, from a throne of gold and gems, an eloquent oration to the senate of Antioch, declared her royal intention of enlarging the walls of the city, bestowed a donative of two hundred pounds of gold to restore the public baths, and accepted the statues, which were decreed by the gratitude of Antioch. In the Holy Land, her alms and pious foundations exceeded the munificence of the great Helena; and though the public treasure might be impoverished by this excessive liberality, she enjoyed the conscious satisfaction of returning to Constantinople with the chains of St. Peter, the right arm of St. Stephen, and an undoubted picture of the Virgin, painted by St. Luke.[1] But this pilgrimage was the fatal term of the glories of Eudocia. Satiated with empty pomp, and unmindful, perhaps, of her obligations to Pulcheria, she ambitiously aspired to the government of the Eastern empire: the palace was distracted by female discord; but the victory was at last decided, by the superior ascendant of the sister of Theodosius. The execution of Paulinus, master of the offices, and the disgrace of Cyrus, Prætorian præfect of the East, convinced the public, that the favour of Eudocia was insufficient to protect her most faithful friends; and the uncommon beauty of Paulinus encouraged the secret rumour, that his guilt was that of a successful lover.[2] As soon as the empress perceived that the affection of Theodosius was irretrievably lost, she requested the permission of retiring to the distant solitude of Jerusalem. She obtained her request; but the jealousy of Theodosius, or the vindictive spirit of Pulcheria, pursued her in her last retreat; and Saturninus, count of the domestics, was directed to punish with death two ecclesiastics, her most favoured servants. Eudocia instantly revenged them by the assassination of the count: the furious passions, which she indulged on this suspicious occasion, seemed to justify the severity of Theodosius; and the empress, ignominiously stript of the honours of her rank,[3] was disgraced, perhaps unjustly, in the eyes of the world. The remainder of the life of Eudocia, about sixteen years, was spent in exile and devotion; and the approach of age, the death of Theodosius, the misfortunes of her only daughter, who was led a captive from Rome to Carthage, and the society of the Holy Monks of Palestine, insensibly confirmed the religious temper of her mind. After a full experience of the vicissitudes of human life, the daughter of the philosopher Leontius expired, at Jerusalem, in the sixty-seventh year of her age; protesting, with her dying breath, that she had never transgressed the bounds of innocence and friendship.[4]

[1] Baronius (Annal. Eccles. A.D. 438, 439.) is copious and florid; but he is accused of placing the lies of different ages on the same level of authenticity.

[2] In this short view of the disgrace of Eudocia, I have imitated the caution of Evag. (l. i. c. 21.), and count Marcellinus (in Chron. A.D. 440. and 444.). The two authentic dates assigned by the latter, overturn a great part of the Greek fictions; and the celebrated story of the *apple*, &c. is fit only for the Arabian Nights, where something not very unlike it may be found.

[3] Priscus (in Excerpt. Legat. p. 69.), a contemporary, and a courtier, dryly mentions her Pagan and Christian names, without adding any title of honour or respect.

[4] For the *two* pilgrimages of Eudocia, and her long residence at Jerusalem, her devotion, alms, &c. see Socr. (l. vii. c. 47.) and Evagr. (l. i. c. 20.). The Paschal Chronicle may sometimes deserve regard; and, in the domestic history of Antioch, John Malala becomes a writer

The gentle mind of Theodosius was never inflamed by the ambition of conquest, or military renown; and the slight alarm of a Persian war scarcely interrupted the tranquillity of the East. The motives of this war were just and honourable. In the last year of the reign of Jezdegerd, the supposed guardian of Theodosius, a bishop, who aspired to the crown of martyrdom, destroyed one of the fire-temples of Susa.[1] His zeal and obstinacy were revenged on his brethren: the Magi excited a cruel persecution; and the intolerant zeal of Jezdegerd was imitated by his son Vararanes, or Bahram, who soon afterwards ascended the throne. Some Christian fugitives, who escaped to the Roman frontier, were sternly demanded, and generously refused; and the refusal, aggravated by commercial disputes, soon kindled a war (A. D. 422) between the rival monarchies. The mountains of Armenia, and the plains of Mesopotamia, were filled with hostile armies; but the operations of two successive campaigns were not productive of any decisive or memorable events. Some engagements were fought, some towns were besieged, with various and doubtful success; and if the Romans failed in their attempt to recover the long lost possession of Nisibis, the Persians were repulsed from the walls of a Mesopotamian city, by the valour of a martial bishop, who pointed his thundering engine in the name of St. Thomas the Apostle. Yet the splendid victories, which the incredible speed of the messenger Palladius repeatedly announced to the palace of Constantinople, were celebrated with festivals and panegyrics. From these panegyrics the historians[2] of the age might borrow their extraordinary, and, perhaps, fabulous, tales; of the proud challenge of a Persian hero, who was entangled by the net, and dispatched by the sword, of Areobindus the Goth; of the 10,000 *Immortals*, who were slain in the attack of the Roman camp; and of the 100,000 Arabs, or Saracens, who were impelled by a panic terror to throw themselves headlong into the Euphrates. Such events may be disbelieved, or disregarded; but the charity of a bishop, Acacius of Amida, whose name might have dignified the saintly calendar, shall not be lost in oblivion. Boldly declaring, that vases of gold and silver are useless to a God who neither eats nor drinks, the generous prelate sold the plate of the church of Amida; employed the price in the redemption of 7000 Persian captives; supplied their wants with affectionate liberality; and dismissed them to their native country, to inform the king of the true spirit of the religion which he persecuted. The practice of benevolence in the midst of war must always tend to assuage the animosity of contending nations; and I wish to persuade myself, that Acacius contributed to the restoration of peace. In the conference which was held on the limits of the two empires, the Roman ambassadors degraded the personal character of their sovereign, by a vain attempt to magnify the extent of his power; when

of good authority. The Abbé Guenée, in a memoir on the fertility of Palestine, of which I have only seen an extract, calculates the gifts of Eudocia at 20,488 pounds of gold, above £800,000.

[1] Theodor. l. v. c. 39. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xii. 356. Assemanni, Biblio. Orient. iii. 396. iv. 61. Theodoret blames the rashness of Abdas, but extols the constancy of his martyrdom. Yet I do not clearly understand the casuistry which prohibits our repairing the damage which we have unlawfully committed.

[2] Socr. (l. vii. c. 18.) is the best author for the Persian war. We may likewise consult the three Chronicles, the Paschal, and those of Marcellinus and Malala.

they seriously advised the Persians to prevent, by a timely accommodation, the wrath of a monarch, who was yet ignorant of this distant war. A truce of one hundred years was solemnly ratified; and, although the revolutions of Armenia might threaten the public tranquillity, the essential conditions of this treaty were respected near fourscore years by the successors of Constantine and Artaxerxes.

Since the Roman and Parthian standards first encountered on the banks of the Euphrates, the kingdom of Armenia[1] was alternately oppressed by its formidable protectors; and, in the course of this History, several events, which inclined the balance of peace and war, have been already related. A disgraceful treaty had resigned Armenia to the ambition of Sapor; and the scale of Persia appeared to preponderate. But the royal race of Arsaces impatiently submitted to the house of Sassan; the turbulent nobles asserted, or betrayed, their hereditary independence; and the nation was still attached to the *Christian* princes of Constantinople. In the beginning of the fifth century, Armenia was divided by the progress of war and faction;[2] and the unnatural division precipitated the downfall of that ancient monarchy. Chosroes, the Persian vassal, reigned over the Eastern and most extensive portion of the country; while the western province acknowledged the jurisdiction (A. D. 431—440) of Arsaces, and the supremacy of the emperor Arcadius. After the death of Arsaces, the Romans suppressed the regal government, and imposed on their allies the condition of subjects. The military command was delegated to the count of the Armenian frontier; the city of Theodosiopolis[3] was built and fortified in a strong situation, on a fertile and lofty ground, near the sources of the Euphrates; and the dependent territories were ruled by five satraps, whose dignity was marked by a peculiar habit of gold and purple. The less fortunate nobles, who lamented the loss of their king, and envied the honours of their equals, were provoked to negociate their peace and pardon at the Persian court; and returning, with their followers, to the palace of Artaxata, acknowledged Chosroes for their lawful sovereign. About thirty years afterwards, Artasires, the nephew and successor of Chosroes, fell under the displeasure of the haughty and capricious nobles of Armenia; and they unanimously desired a Persian governor in the room of an unworthy king. The answer of the archbishop Isaac, whose sanction they earnestly solicited, is expressive of the character of a superstitious people. He deplored the manifest and inexcusable

[1] This account of the ruin and division of the kingdom of Armenia is taken from the third book of the Armenian history of Moses of Chorene. Deficient as he is in every qualification of a good historian, his local information, his passions, and his prejudices, are strongly expressive of a native and contemporary. Procop. (de Edific. l. iii. c. 1. 5.) relates the same facts in a very different manner; but I have extracted the circumstances the most probable in themselves, and the least inconsistent with Moses of Chorene.

[2] The western Armenians used the Greek language and characters in their religious offices; but the use of that hostile tongue was prohibited by the Persians in the eastern provinces, which were obliged to use the Syriac, till the invention of the Armenian letters by Mesrobes, in the beginning of the fifth century, and the subsequent version of the Bible into the Armenian language; an event which relaxed the connexion of the church and nation with Constantinople.

[3] Moses Choren. l. iii. c. 59. p. 309. 358. Procop. de Edific. l. iii. c. 5. Theodosiopolis stands, or rather stood, about 35 miles to the east of Erzeroum, the modern capital of Turkish Armenia. D'Anville, Geog. Ancien. ii. 99.

vices of Artasires; and declared, that he should not hesitate to accuse him before the tribunal of a Christian emperor, who would punish, without destroying, the sinner. "Our king," continued Isaac, "is too "much addicted to licentious pleasures, but he has been purified in "the holy waters of baptism. He is a lover of women, but he does "not adore the fire or the elements. He may deserve the reproach "of lewdness, but he is an undoubted Catholic; and his faith is pure, "though his manners are flagitious. I will never consent to abandon "my sheep to the rage of devouring wolves; and you would soon "repent your rash exchange of the infirmities of a believer, for the "specious virtues of an heathen."[1] Exasperated by the firmness of Isaac, the factious nobles accused both the king and the archbishop as the secret adherents of the emperor; and absurdly rejoiced in the sentence of condemnation, which, after a partial hearing, was solemnly pronounced by Bahram himself. The descendants of Arsaces were degraded from the royal dignity,[2] which they had possessed above five hundred and sixty years;[3] and the dominions of the unfortunate Artasires, under the new and significant appellation of Persarmenia, were reduced into the form of a province. This usurpation excited the jealousy of the Roman government; but the rising disputes were soon terminated by an amicable, though unequal, partition of the ancient kingdom of Armenia; and a territorial acquisition, which Augustus might have despised, reflected some lustre on the declining empire of the younger Theodosius.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Death of Honorius.— Valentinian III. *Emperor of the West.— Administration of his Mother Placidia.—Ætius and Boniface.— Conquest of Africa by the Vandals.*

DURING a long and disgraceful reign of twenty-eight years, Honorius, emperor of the West, was separated from the friendship of his brother, and afterwards of his nephew, who reigned over the East; and Constantinople beheld, with apparent indifference and secret joy, the calamities of Rome. The strange adventures of Placidia (Chap. xxxi.) gradually renewed, and cemented, the alliance of the two em-

[1] Moses Choren. l. iii. c. 63. p. 316. According to the institution of St. Gregory the apostle of Armenia, the archbishop was always of the royal family; a circumstance, which, in some degree, corrected the influence of the sacerdotal character, and united the mitre with the crown.

[2] A branch of the royal house of Arsaces still subsisted with the rank and possessions (as it should seem) of Armenian satraps. Moses Choren. l. iii. c. 65. p. 321.

[3] Valarsaces was appointed king of Armenia by his brother the Parthian monarch, immediately after the defeat of Antiochus Sidetes (Moses Choren. l. ii. c. 2. p. 85.), 130 years before Christ. Without depending on the various and contradictory periods of the reigns of the last kings, we may be assured, that the ruin of the Armenian kingdom happened after the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 431. (l. iii. c. 61. p. 312.); and under Veramus, or Bahram, king of Persia (l. iii. c. 64. p. 317.), who reigned from A.D. 420 to 440. Assemanni, Bibliot. Orient. iii. 396.

pires. The daughter of the great Theodosius had been the captive and the queen of the Goths: she lost an affectionate husband; she was dragged in chains by his insulting assassin; she tasted the pleasure of revenge, and was exchanged, in the treaty of peace, for 600,000 measures of wheat. After her return from Spain to Italy, Placidia experienced a new persecution in the bosom of her family. She was averse to a marriage, which had been stipulated without her consent; and the brave Constantius, as a noble reward for the tyrants whom he had vanquished, received, from the hand of Honorius himself, the struggling and reluctant hand of the widow of Adolphus. But her resistance ended with the ceremony of the nuptials; nor did Placidia refuse to become the mother of Honoria and Valentinian the third, or to assume and exercise an absolute dominion over the mind of her grateful husband. The generous soldier, whose time had hitherto been divided between social pleasure and military service, was taught new lessons of avarice and ambition: he extorted the title of Augustus; and the servant of Honorius was associated to the empire of the West. The death of Constantius, in the seventh month of his reign, instead of diminishing, seemed to increase, the power of Placidia. On a sudden, by some base intrigues of a steward and a nurse, the peace of the palace was converted into an irreconcileable quarrel: the debates of the emperor and his sister were not long confined within the walls of the palace; and as the Gothic soldiers adhered to their queen, the city of Ravenna was agitated with bloody and dangerous tumults, which could only be appeased by the forced or voluntary retreat of Placidia and her children. The royal exiles landed at Constantinople, soon after the marriage of Theodosius, during the festival of the Persian victories. They were treated with kindness and magnificence; but as the statues of the emperor Constantius had been rejected by the Eastern court, the title of Augusta could not decently be allowed to his widow. Within a few months after the arrival of Placidia, a swift messenger announced the death of Honorius (A. D. 423. Aug. 27), the consequence of a dropsy; but the important secret was not divulged, till the necessary orders had been dispatched for the march of a large body of troops to the sea-coast of Dalmatia. The shops and the gates of Constantinople remained shut during seven days; and the loss of a foreign prince, who could neither be esteemed nor regretted, was celebrated with loud and affected demonstrations of the public grief.

While the ministers of Constantinople deliberated, the vacant throne of Honorius was usurped (A. D. 423—425) by the ambition of a stranger. The name of the rebel was John: he filled the confidential office of *Primicerius*, or principal secretary; and history has attributed to his character more virtues, than can easily be reconciled with the violation of the most sacred duty. Elated by the submission of Italy, and the hope of an alliance with the Huns, John presumed to insult, by an embassy, the majesty of the Eastern emperor; but when he understood that his agents had been banished, imprisoned, and at length chased away with deserved ignominy, John prepared to assert. by arms, the injustice of his claims. In such a cause, the grandson of the great Theodosius should have marched in person: but the young

emperor was easily diverted, by his physicians, from so rash and hazardous a design; and the conduct of the Italian expedition was prudently entrusted to Ardaburius, and his son Aspar, who had already signalized their valour against the Persians. It was resolved, that Ardaburius should embark with the infantry; whilst Aspar, at the head of the cavalry, conducted Placidia, and her son Valentinian, along the sea-coast of the Adriatic. The march of the cavalry was performed with such active diligence, that they surprised, without resistance, the important city of Aquileia; when the hopes of Aspar were unexpectedly confounded by the intelligence, that a storm had dispersed the Imperial fleet; and that his father, with only two gallies, was taken and carried a prisoner into the port of Ravenna. Yet this incident, unfortunate as it might seem, facilitated the conquest of Italy. Ardaburius employed, or abused, the courteous freedom, which he was permitted to enjoy, to revive among the troops a sense of loyalty and gratitude; and, as soon as the conspiracy was ripe for execution, he invited, by private messages, and pressed the approach of, Aspar. A shepherd, whom the popular credulity transformed into an angel, guided the Eastern cavalry by a secret, and, it was thought, an impassable road, through the morasses of the Po: the gates of Ravenna, after a short struggle, were thrown open; and the defenceless tyrant was delivered to the mercy, or rather to the cruelty, of the conquerors. His right hand was first cut off; and, after he had been exposed, mounted on an ass, to the public derision, John was beheaded in the Circus of Aquileia. The emperor Theodosius, when he received the news of the victory, interrupted the horse-races; and singing, as he marched through the streets, a suitable psalm, conducted his people from the Hippodrome to the church, where he spent the remainder of the day in grateful devotion.[1]

In a monarchy which, according to various precedents, might be considered as elective, or hereditary, or patrimonial, it was impossible that the intricate claims of female and collateral succession should be clearly defined;[2] and Theodosius, by the right of consanguinity or conquest, might have reigned the sole legitimate emperor of the Romans. For a moment, perhaps, his eyes were dazzled by the prospect of unbounded sway; but his indolent temper gradually acquiesced in the dictates of sound policy. He contented himself with the possession of the East; and wisely relinquished the laborious task, of waging a distant and doubtful war against the Barbarians beyond the Alps; or of securing the obedience of the Italians and Africans, whose minds were alienated by the irreconcileable difference of language and interest. Instead of listening to the voice of ambition, Theodosius resolved to imitate the moderation of his grandfather, and to seat his cousin Valentinian on the (A.D. 425—455) throne of the West. The royal infant was distinguished at Constantinople by the title of *Nobilissimus:* he was promoted, before his departure from Thessalonica, to the rank

[1] For these revolutions of the Western empire, consult Olympiodor. apud Phot. p. 192. 196. 200. Soz. l. ix. c. 16. Socr. l. vii. 23. Philostorg. l. xii. c. 10, 11. and Godefroy, p. 486. Procop. de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 3. p. 182. Theophanes, in Chronog. p. 72. and the Chron.

[2] Grotius de Jure Belli et Pacis, l. ii. c. 7. He has laboriously, but vainly, attempted to form a reasonable system of jurisprudence, from the various and discordant modes of royal succession, which have been introduced by fraud, or force, by time, or accident.

and dignity of *Cæsar;* and, after the conquest of Italy, the patrician Helion, by the authority of Theodosius, and in the presence of the senate, saluted Valentinian the third by the name of Augustus, and solemnly invested him with the diadem, and the Imperial purple.[1] By the agreement of the three females who governed the Roman world, the son of Placidia was betrothed to Eudoxia, the daughter of Theodosius and Athenais; and, as soon as the lover and his bride had come of age, this honourable alliance was faithfully accomplished. At the same time, as a compensation, perhaps, for the expences of the war, the Western Illyricum was detached from the Italian dominions, and yielded to the throne of Constantinople.[2] The emperor of the East acquired the useful dominion of the rich and maritime province of Dalmatia, and the dangerous sovereignty of Pannonia and Noricum, which had been filled and ravaged above twenty years, by a promiscuous crowd of Huns, Ostrogoths, Vandals, and *Bavarians.* Theodosius and Valentinian continued to respect the obligations of their public and domestic alliance; but the unity of the Roman government was finally dissolved. By a positive declaration, the validity of all future laws was limited to the dominions of their peculiar author; unless he should think proper to communicate them, subscribed, with his own hand, for the approbation of his independent colleague.[3]

Valentinian, when he received the title of Augustus, was no more than six years of age: and his long minority was entrusted to the guardian care of a mother, who might assert a female claim to the succession of the Western empire. Placidia envied, but she could not equal, the reputation and virtues of the wife and sister of Theodosius; the elegant genius of Eudocia, the wise and successful policy of Pulcheria. The mother of Valentinian was jealous of the power, which she was incapable of exercising:[4] she reigned (A.D. 425—450) twenty-five years, in the name of her son; and the character of that unworthy emperor gradually countenanced the suspicion, that Placidia had enervated his youth by a dissolute education, and studiously diverted his attention from every manly and honourable pursuit. Amidst the decay of military spirit, her armies were commanded by two generals, Ætius[5] and Boniface,[6] who may be deservedly named as the last of the Ro-

[1] The original writers are not agreed (Muratori, Annali d'Italia, iv. 139.) whether Valentinian received the Imperial diadem at Rome or Ravenna. In this uncertainty, I am willing to believe that some respect was shown to the senate.

[2] De Buat (Hist. des Peup. de l'Eur. vii. 292.) has established the reality, explained the motives, and traced the consequences, of this remarkable cession.

[3] See the first *Novel* of Theodosius, by which he ratifies and communicates (A.D. 438.) the Theod. Code. About 40 years before that time, the unity of legislation had been proved by an exception. The Jews, who were numerous in the cities of Apulia and Calabria, produced a law of the East to justify their exemption from municipal offices (Cod. Theod. l. xvi. tit. viii. leg. 13.); and the Western emperor was obliged to invalidate, by a special edict, the law, quam constat meis partibus esse damnosam. Cod. Theod. l. xi. tit. i. leg. 158.

[4] Cassiodor. (Varior. l. xi. epist. i. 238.) has compared the regencies of Placidia and Amalasuntha. He arraigns the weakness of the mother of Valentinian, and praises the virtues of his royal mistress. On this occasion, flattery seems to have spoken the language of truth.

[5] Philostorg. l. xii. c. 12. and Godefroy, p. 493.; and Renatus Frigeridus, apud Greg. Turon. l. ii. c. 8. ii. 163. The father of Ætius was Gaudentius, an illustrious citizen of the province of Scythia, and master-general of the cavalry: his mother was a rich and noble Italian. From his earliest youth, Ætius, as a soldier and a hostage, had conversed with the Babarians.

[6] For the character of Boniface, see Olympiod. apud Phot. p. 196.; and St. Aug. apud Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xiii. p. 712. 886. The bishop of Hippo at length deplored the fall of

mans. Their union might have supported a sinking empire; their discord was the fatal and immediate cause of the loss of Africa. The invasion and defeat of Attila have immortalized the fame of Ætius; and though time has thrown a shade over the exploits of his rival, the defence of Marseilles, and the deliverance of Africa, attest the military talents of Count Boniface. In the field of battle, in partial encounters, in single combats, he was still the terror of the Barbarians; the clergy, and particularly his friend Augustin, were edified by the Christian piety, which had once tempted him to retire from the world; the people applauded his spotless integrity; the army dreaded his equal and inexorable justice, which he displayed in a very singular example. A peasant, who complained of the criminal intimacy between his wife and a Gothic soldier, was directed to attend his tribunal the following day: in the evening the count, who had diligently informed himself of the time and place of the assignation, mounted his horse, rode ten miles into the country, surprised the guilty couple, punished the soldier with instant death, and silenced the complaints of the husband, by presenting him, the next morning, with the head of the adulterer. The abilities of Ætius and Boniface might have been usefully employed against the public enemies, in separate and important commands; but the experience of their past conduct should have decided the real favour and confidence of the empress Placidia. In the melancholy season of her exile and distress, Boniface alone had maintained her cause with unshaken fidelity; and the troops and treasures of Africa had essentially contributed to extinguish the rebellion. The same rebellion had been supported by the zeal and activity of Ætius, who brought an army of 60,000 Huns from the Danube to the confines of Italy, for the service of the usurper. The untimely death of John compelled him to accept an advantageous treaty; but he still continued, the subject and the soldier of Valentinian, to entertain a secret, perhaps a treasonable, correspondence with his Barbarian allies, whose retreat had been purchased by liberal gifts, and more liberal promises. But Ætius possessed an advantage of singular moment in a female reign: he was present: he besieged, with artful and assiduous flattery, the palace of Ravenna; disguised his dark designs with the mask of loyalty and friendship; and at length deceived both his mistress and his absent rival, by a subtle conspiracy, which a weak woman, and a brave man, could not easily suspect. He secretly persuaded[1] Placidia to recall (A.D. 427) Boniface from the government of Africa; he secretly advised Boniface to disobey the Imperial summons: to the one, he represented the order as a sentence of death; to the other, he stated the refusal as a signal of revolt; and when the credulous and unsuspectful count had armed the province in his defence, Ætius applauded his sagacity in foreseeing the rebellion, which his own perfidy had excited. A temperate enquiry into the real motives of Boniface, would have restored a faithful servant to his duty and to the republic; but the arts of Ætius still

his friend, who, after a solemn vow of chastity, had married a second wife of the Arian sect, and who was suspected of keeping several concubines in his house.

[1] Procop. (de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 3, 4. p. 182.) relates the fraud of Ætius, the revolt of Boniface, and the loss of Africa. This anecdote, which is supported by some collateral testimony (Ruinart. Hist. Persecut. Vandal. p. 420.), seems agreeable to the practice of ancient and modern courts, and would be naturally revealed by the repentance of Boniface.

continued to betray and to inflame, and the count was urged, by persecution, to embrace the most desperate counsels. The success with which he eluded or repelled the first attacks, could not inspire a vain confidence, that, at the head of some loose, disorderly Africans, he should be able to withstand the regular forces of the West, commanded by a rival, whose military character it was impossible for him to despise. After some hesitation, the last struggles of prudence and loyalty, Boniface dispatched a trusty friend to the court, or rather to the camp, of Gonderic, king of the Vandals, with the proposal of a strict alliance, and the offer of an advantageous and perpetual settlement.

After the retreat of the Goths, the authority of Honorius had obtained a precarious establishment in Spain; except only in the province of Gallicia, where the Suevi and the Vandals had fortified their camps, in mutual discord, and hostile independence. The Vandals prevailed; and their adversaries were besieged in the Nervasian hills, between Leon and Oviedo, till the approach of Count Asterius compelled, or rather provoked, the victorious Barbarians to remove (A.D. 428) the scene of the war to the plains of Bœtica. The rapid progress of the Vandals soon required a more effectual opposition; and the master-general Castinus marched against them with a numerous army of Romans and Goths. Vanquished in battle by an inferior enemy, Castinus fled with dishonour to Tarragona; and this memorable defeat, which has been represented as the punishment, was most probably the effect, of his rash presumption.[1] Seville and Carthagena became the reward, or rather the prey, of the ferocious conquerors; and the vessels which they found in the harbour of Carthagena, might easily transport them to the isles of Majorca and Minorca, where the Spanish fugitives, as in a secure recess, had vainly concealed their families and their fortunes. The experience of navigation, and perhaps the prospect of Africa, encouraged the Vandals to accept the invitation which they received from Count Boniface; and the death of Gonderic served only to forward and animate the bold enterprise. In the room of a prince, not conspicuous for any superior powers of the mind or body, they acquired his bastard brother, the terrible Genseric;[2] a name, which, in the destruction of the Roman empire, has deserved an equal rank with the names of Alaric and Attila. The king of the Vandals is described to have been of a middle stature, with a lameness in one leg, which he had contracted by an accidental fall from his horse. His slow and cautious speech seldom declared the deep purposes of his soul: he disdained to imitate the luxury of the vanquished; but he indulged the sterner passions of anger and revenge. The ambition of Genseric was without bounds, and without scruples; and the warrior could dexterously employ the dark engines

[1] Chronicles of Prosper and Idatius. Salvian (de Gubernat. Dei, l. vii. 246. Paris, 1608.) ascribes the victory of the Vandals to their superior piety. They fasted, they prayed, they carried a Bible in the front of the Host, with the design, perhaps, of reproaching the perfidy and sacrilege of their enemies.

[2] Gizericus (his name is variously expressed) staturâ mediocris et equi casû claudicans, animo profundus, sermone rarus, luxuriæ contemptor, irâ turbidus habendi, cupidus, ad solicitandas gentes providentissimus, semina contentionum jacere, odia miscere paratus. Jornan. de Reb. Get. c. 33. p. 657. This portrait, which is drawn with some skill, and a strong likeness, must have been copied from the Gothic history of Cassiodorus.

of policy to solicit the allies who might be useful to his success, or to scatter among his enemies the seeds of hatred and contention. Almost in the moment of his departure he was informed, that Hermanric, king of the Suevi, had presumed to ravage the Spanish territories, which he was resolved to abandon. Impatient of the insult, Genseric pursued the hasty retreat of the Suevi as far as Merida; precipitated the king and his army into the river Anas, and calmly returned to the sea-shore, to embark his victorious troops. The vessels which (A.D. 429. May) transported the Vandals over the modern Straits of Gibraltar, a channel only twelve miles in breadth, were furnished by the Spaniards, who anxiously wished their departure; and by the African general, who had implored their formidable assistance.[1]

Our fancy, so long accustomed to exaggerate and multiply the martial swarms of Barbarians that seemed to issue from the North, will perhaps be surprised by the account of the army which Genseric mustered on the coast of Mauritania (A.D. 429). The Vandals, who in twenty years had penetrated from the Elbe to Mount Atlas, were united under the command of their warlike king; and he reigned with equal authority over the Alani, who had passed, within the term of human life, from the cold of Scythia to the excessive heat of an African climate. The hopes of the bold enterprise had excited many brave adventurers of the Gothic nation; and many desperate provincials were tempted to repair their fortunes by the same means which had occasioned their ruin. Yet this various multitude amounted only to 50,000 effective men; and though Genseric artfully magnified his apparent strength, by appointing eighty *chiliarchs*, or commanders of thousands, the fallacious increase of old men, of children, and of slaves, would scarcely have swelled his army to the number of 80,000 persons.[2] But his own dexterity, and the discontents of Africa, soon fortified the Vandal powers, by the accession of numerous and active allies. The parts of Mauritania, which border on the great desert, and the Atlantic ocean, were filled with a fierce and untractable race of men, whose savage temper had been exasperated, rather than reclaimed, by their dread of the Roman arms. The wandering Moors,[3] as they gradually ventured to approach the sea-shore, and the camp of the Vandals, must have viewed with terror and astonishment the dress, the armour, the martial pride and discipline of the unknown strangers, who had landed on their coast; and the fair complexions of the blue-eyed warriors of Germany, formed a very singular

[1] Chron. of Idatius. That bishop, a Spaniard and a contemporary, places the passage of the Vandals, in May, of the year of Abraham (which commences Oct.) 2444. This date, which coincides with A.D. 429, is confirmed by Isidore, another Spanish bishop, and is justly preferred to the opinion of those writers, who have marked for that event, one of the two preceding years. Pagi Critica, ii. 205.

[2] Procop. (de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 5. p. 190.). Victor Vitensis (de Persecut. Vandal. l. i. c. 1. p. 3.) We are assured by Idatius, that Genseric evacuated Spain, cum Vandalis *omnibus* eorumque familiis; and Possidius (Vit. Aug. c. 28. apud Ruinart, p. 427.) describes his army, as manus ingens immanium gentium Vandalorum et Alanorum, commixtam secum habens Gothorum gentem, aliarumque diversarum personas.

[3] For the manners of the Moors, see Procop. (de Bell. Vandal. l. ii. c. 6. p. 249.); for their figure and complexion, M. de Buffon (Hist. Natur. iii. 430.). Procopius says in general, that the Moors had joined the Vandals before the death of Valentinian (de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 5. p. 190.); and it is probable, that the independent tribes did not embrace any uniform system of policy.

contrast with the swarthy or olive hue, which is derived from the neighbourhood of the torrid zone. After the first difficulties had in some measure been removed, which arose from the mutual ignorance of their respective language, the Moors, regardless of any future consequence, embraced the alliance of the enemies of Rome; and a crowd of naked savages rushed from the woods and valleys of Mount Atlas, to satiate their revenge on the polished tyrants, who had injuriously expelled them from the native sovereignty of the land.

The persecution of the Donatists [1] was an event not less favourable to the designs of Genseric. Seventeen years before he landed in Africa, a public conference was held at Carthage, by the order of the magistrate. The Catholics were satisfied, that, after the invincible reasons which they had alleged, the obstinacy of the schismatics must be inexcusable and voluntary; and the emperor Honorius was persuaded to inflict the most rigorous penalties on a faction, which had so long abused his patience and clemency. Three hundred bishops,[2] with many thousands of the inferior clergy, were torn from their churches, stripped of their ecclesiastical possessions, banished to the islands, and proscribed by the laws, if they presumed to conceal themselves in the provinces of Africa. Their numerous congregations, both in cities and in the country, were deprived of the rights of citizens, and of the exercise of religious worship. A regular scale of fines, from ten to two hundred pounds of silver, was curiously ascertained, according to the distinctions of rank and fortune, to punish the crime of assisting at a schismatic conventicle; and if the fine had been levied five times, without subduing the obstinacy of the offender, his future punishment was referred to the discretion of the Imperial court.[3] By these severities, which obtained the warmest approbation of St. Augustin,[4] great numbers of Donatists were reconciled to the Catholic church : but the fanatics, who still persevered in their opposition, were provoked to madness and despair; the distracted country was filled with tumult and bloodshed; the armed troops of Circumcellions alternately pointed their rage against themselves, or against their adversaries; and the calendar of martyrs received on both sides a considerable augmentation.[5] Under these circumstances, Genseric, a Christian, but an enemy of the orthodox communion, showed himself to the Donatists as a powerful deliverer, from whom they might

[1] Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xiii. 516. ; and the whole series of the persecution, in the original monuments, published by Dupin at the end of Optatus, p. 323—515.

[2] The Donatist bishops, at the conference of Carthage, amounted to 279; and they asserted, that their whole number was not less than 400. The Catholics had 286 present, 120 absent, besides 64 vacant bishoprics.

[3] Theod. Code, t. 5. B. xvi. exhibits a series of the Imperial laws against the Donatists, from A.D. 400 to 428. Of these the 54th law, promulgated by Honorius, A.D. 414, is the most severe and effectual.

[4] St. Augustin altered his opinion with regard to the proper treatment of heretics. His pathetic declaration of pity and indulgence, for the Manichæans, has been inserted by Locke (iii. 469.) among the choice specimens of his common-place book. Another philosopher, the celebrated Bayle (ii. 445.), has refuted, with superfluous diligence and ingenuity, the arguments, by which the bishop of Hippo justified, in his old age, the persecution of the Donatists.

[5] Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xiii. 586. The Donatists boasted of *thousands* of these voluntary martyrs. Augustin asserts, and probably with truth, that these numbers were much exaggerated; but he sternly maintains, that it was better that *some* should burn themselves in this world, than that *all* should burn in hell flames.

reasonably expect the repeal of the odious and oppressive edicts of the Roman emperors.[1] The conquest of Africa was facilitated by the active zeal, or the secret favour, of a domestic faction; the wanton outrages against the churches, and the clergy, of which the Vandals are accused, may be fairly imputed to the fanaticism of their allies; and the intolerant spirit, which disgraced the triumph of Christianity, contributed to the loss of the most important provinces of the West.[2]

The court and the people were astonished by the strange intelligence, that a virtuous hero, after so many favours, and so many services, had (A.D. 430) renounced his allegiance, and invited the Barbarians to destroy the province entrusted to his command. The friends of Boniface, who still believed that his criminal behaviour might be excused by some honourable motive, solicited, during the absence of Ætius, a free conference with the count of Africa; and Darius, an officer of high distinction, was named for the important embassy.[3] In their first interview at Carthage, the imaginary provocations were mutually explained; the opposite letters of Ætius were produced and compared; and the fraud was easily detected. Placidia and Boniface lamented their fatal error; and the Count had sufficient magnanimity to confide in the forgiveness of his sovereign, or to expose his head to her future resentment. His repentance was fervent and sincere; but he soon discovered, that it was no longer in his power to restore the edifice which he had shaken to its foundations. Carthage, and the Roman garrisons, returned with their general to the allegiance of Valentinian; but the rest of Africa was still distracted with war and faction; and the inexorable king of the Vandals, disdaining all terms of accommodation, sternly refused to relinquish the possession of his prey. The band of veterans, who marched under the standard of Boniface, and his hasty levies of provincial troops, were defeated with considerable loss: the victorious Barbarians insulted the open country; and Carthage, Cirta, and Hippo Regius, were the only cities that appeared to rise above the general inundation.

The long and narrow tract of the African coast was filled with frequent monuments of Roman art and magnificence; and the respective degrees of improvement might be accurately measured by the distance from Carthage and the Mediterranean. A simple reflection will impress every thinking mind with the clearest idea of fertility and cultivation: the country was extremely populous; the inhabitants reserved a liberal subsistence for their own use; and the annual exportation, particularly of wheat, was so regular and plentiful, that Africa deserved

[1] According to St. Augustin and Theodoret, the Donatists were inclined to the principles, or at least to the party, of the Arians, which Genseric supported. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. vi. 68.

[2] Baron. Annal. Eccles. A.D. 428. No. 7. A.D. 439. No. 35. The cardinal, though more inclined to seek the cause of great events in heaven than on the earth, has observed the apparent connexion of the Vandals and the Donatists. Under the reign of the Barbarians, the schismatics of Africa enjoyed an obscure peace of one hundred years; at the end of which, we may again trace them by the light of the Imperial persecutions. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. vi. 192.

[3] In a confidential letter to Count Boniface, St. Augustin, without examining the grounds of the quarrel, piously exhorts him to discharge the duties of a Christian and a subject; to extricate himself without delay from his dangerous and guilty situation; and even, if he could obtain the consent of his wife, to embrace a life of celibacy and penance (Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xiii. 890.). The bishop was intimately connected with Darius, the minister of peace (Id. xiii. 928.).

the name of the common granary of Rome and of mankind. On a sudden, the seven fruitful provinces, from Tangier to Tripoli, were overwhelmed by the invasion of the Vandals; whose destructive rage has perhaps been exaggerated by popular animosity, religious zeal, and extravagant declamation. War, in its fairest form, implies a perpetual violation of humanity and justice; and the hostilities of Barbarians are inflamed by the fierce and lawless spirit which incessantly disturbs their peaceful and domestic society. The Vandals, where they found resistance, seldom gave quarter; and the deaths of their valiant countrymen were expiated by the ruin of the cities under whose walls they had fallen. Careless of the distinctions of age, or sex, or rank, they employed every species of indignity and torture, to force from the captives a discovery of their hidden wealth. The stern policy of Genseric justified his frequent examples of military execution: he was not always the master of his own passions, or of those of his followers; and the calamities of war were aggravated by the licentiousness of the Moors, and the fanaticism of the Donatists. Yet I shall not easily be persuaded, that it was the common practice of the Vandals to extirpate the olives, and other fruit-trees, of a country where they intended to settle: nor can I believe that it was a usual stratagem to slaughter great numbers of their prisoners before the walls of a besieged city, for the sole purpose of infecting the air, and producing a pestilence, of which they themselves must have been the first victims.[1]

The generous mind of Count Boniface was tortured by the exquisite distress of beholding the ruin, which he had occasioned, and whose rapid progress he was unable to check. After the loss of a battle, he retired into Hippo Regius; where (A.D. 430. May) he was immediately besieged by an enemy, who considered him as the real bulwark of Africa. The maritime colony of *Hippo*,[2] about 200 miles westward of Carthage. had formerly acquired the distinguishing epithet of *Regius*, from the residence of Numidian kings; and some remains of trade and populousness still adhere to the modern city, which is known in Europe by the corrupted name of Bona. The military labours and anxious reflections of Count Boniface, were alleviated by the edifying conversation of his friend St. Augustin;[3] till that bishop, the light and pillar of the Catholic church, was (A.D. 430. Aug. 28) gently released, in the third month of the siege, and in the 76th year of his age, from the actual and the impending calamities of his country. The youth of Augustin had been stained by the vices and errors, which he so ingenuously confesses; but from the moment of his conversion, to that

[1] The original complaints of the desolation of Africa are contained, 1. In a letter from Capreolus, bishop of Carthage, to excuse his absence from the council of Ephesus (Ruinart, p. 429.). 2. In the Life of St. Augustin, by his friend and colleague Possidius (Ruinart, p. 427.). 3. Hist. of Vandal. Persecut. by Vict. Vitensis (l. i. c. 1, 2, 3. ed. Ruinart). The last picture, which was drawn sixty years after the event, is more expressive of the author's passions than of the truth of facts.

[2] Cellarius, Geog. Antiq. ii. part ii. 112. Leo African. in Ramusio, i. 70. L'Afrique de Marmol. ii. 434. Shaw's Travels, p. 46. The old Hippo Regius was finally destroyed by the Arabs in the seventh century; but a new town, at the distance of two miles, was built with the materials; and it contained, in the sixteenth century, about three hundred families of industrious, but turbulent, manufacturers. The adjacent territory is renowned for a pure air, a fertile soil, and plenty of exquisite fruits.

[3] The Life of St. Augustin, by Tillemont, fills a quarto volume (Mem. Eccles. xiii.) of more than 1000 pages; and the diligence of that learned Jansenist was excited, on this occasion, by factious and devout zeal for the founder of his sect.

of his death, the manners of the bishop of Hippo were pure and austere: and the most conspicuous of his virtues was an ardent zeal against heretics of every denomination; the Manichæans, the Donatists, and the Pelagians, against whom he waged a perpetual controversy. When the city, some months after his death, was burnt by the Vandals, the library was fortunately saved, which contained his voluminous writings; 232 separate books or treatises on theological subjects, besides a complete exposition of the Psalter and the Gospel, and a copious magazine of epistles and homilies.[1] According to the judgment of the most impartial critics, the superficial learning of Augustin was confined to the Latin language;[2] and his style, though sometimes animated by the eloquence of passion, is usually clouded by false and affected rhetoric. But he possessed a strong, capacious, argumentative mind; he boldly founded the dark abyss of grace, predestination, free-will, and original sin; and the rigid system of Christianity which he framed or restored,[3] has been entertained, with public applause, and secret reluctance, by the Latin church.[4]

By the skill of Boniface, and perhaps by the ignorance of the Vandals, the siege of Hippo was (A.D. 431) protracted above fourteen months: the sea was continually open; and when the adjacent country had been exhausted by irregular rapine, the besiegers themselves were compelled by famine to relinquish their enterprise. The importance and danger of Africa were deeply felt by the regent of the West. Placidia implored the assistance of her eastern ally; and the Italian fleet and army were reinforced by Aspar, who sailed from Constantinople with a powerful armament. As soon as the force of the two empires was united under the command of Boniface, he boldly marched against the Vandals; and the loss of a second battle irretrievably decided the fate of Africa. He embarked with the precipitation of despair; and the people of Hippo were permitted, with their families and effects, to occupy the vacant place of the soldiers, the greatest part of whom were either slain or made prisoners by the Vandals. The Count, whose fatal credulity had wounded the vitals of the republic, might enter the palace of Ravenna with some anxiety, which was soon removed by the smiles of Placidia. Boniface accepted with gratitude the rank of patrician,

[1] Such at least is the account of Vict. Vitensis (de Persec. Vandal. l. i. c. 3.); though Gennadius seems to doubt whether any person had read, or even collected, *all* the works of St. Augustin (Hieronym. Opera, i. 319. in Catalog. Script. Eccles.) They have been repeatedly printed; and Dupin (Biblio. Eccles. iii. 158.) has given a large and satisfactory abstract of them, as they stand in the last edition of the Benedictines. My personal acquaintance with the bishop of Hippo does not extend beyond the *Confessions*, and the *City of God*.

[2] In his early youth (Confess. i. 14.) St. Augustin disliked and neglected the study of Greek; and he frankly owns that he read the Platonists in a Latin version (Confess. vii. 9.). Some modern critics have thought that his ignorance of Greek disqualified him from expounding the Scriptures; and Cicero or Quintilian would have required the knowledge of that language in a professor of rhetoric.

[3] These questions were seldom agitated, from the time of St. Paul to that of St. Augustin. I am informed that the Greek fathers maintain the natural sentiments of the Semi-pelagians, and that the orthodoxy of St. Augustin was derived from the Manichæan school.

[4] The church of Rome has canonized Augustin, and reprobated Calvin. Yet as the *real* difference between them is invisible even to a theological microscope; the Molinists are oppressed by the authority of the saint, and the Jansenists are disgraced by their resemblance to the heretic. In the mean while the Protestant Armenians stand aloof, and deride the mutual perplexity of the disputants (Review of the Controv. by Le Clerc, Biblio. Univer. xiv. 144.). Perhaps a reasoner still more independent, may smile in *his* turn, when he peruses an Armenian Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.

and the dignity of master-general of the Roman armies; but he must have blushed at the sight of those medals, in which he was represented with the name and attributes of victory.[1] The discovery of his fraud, the displeasure of the empress, and the distinguished favour of his rival, exasperated the haughty and perfidious soul of Ætius. He hastily returned from Gaul to Italy, with a retinue, or rather with an army, of Barbarian followers; and such was the weakness of the government, that the two generals decided their private quarrel in a bloody battle. Boniface was successful; but he received in the conflict a mortal wound from the spear of his adversary, of which he expired within a few days (A.D. 432), in such Christian and charitable sentiments, that he exhorted his wife, a rich heiress of Spain, to accept Ætius for her second husband. But Ætius could not derive any immediate advantage from the generosity of his dying enemy: he was proclaimed a rebel by the justice of Placidia; and though he attempted to defend some strong fortresses erected on his patrimonial estate, the Imperial power soon compelled him to retire into Pannonia, to the tents of his faithful Huns. The republic was deprived, by their mutual discord, of the service of her two most illustrious champions.[2]

It might naturally be expected, after the retreat of Boniface, that the Vandals would achieve, without resistance or delay, the conquest of Africa. Eight years (A.D. 431—439) however elapsed, from the evacuation of Hippo to the reduction of Carthage. In the midst of that interval, the ambitious Genseric, in the full tide of apparent prosperity, negociated a treaty of peace, by which he gave his son Hunneric for an hostage; and consented to leave the Western emperor in the undisturbed possession of the three Mauritanias.[3] This moderation, which cannot be imputed to the justice, must be ascribed to the policy, of the conqueror. His throne was encompassed with domestic enemies; who accused the baseness of his birth, and asserted the legitimate claims of his nephews, the sons of Gonderic. Those nephews, indeed, he sacrificed to his safety; and their mother, the widow of the deceased king, was precipitated, by his order, into the river Ampsaga. But the public discontent burst forth in dangerous and frequent conspiracies; and the warlike tyrant is supposed to have shed more Vandal blood by the hand of the executioner, than in the field of battle.[4] The convulsions of Africa, which had favoured his attack, opposed the firm establishment of his power; and the various seditions

[1] Ducange, Fam. Byzant. p. 67. On one side, the head of Valentinian; on the reverse, Boniface, with a scourge in one hand, and a palm in the other, standing in a triumphal car, which is drawn by four horses, or, in another medal, by four stags; an unlucky emblem! I should doubt whether another example can be found of the head of a subject on the reverse of an Imperial medal. Science des Medailles, by the Père Jobert, i. 132. ed. 1739, by Baron de la Bastie.

[2] Procop. (de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 3. p. 185.) continues the history of Boniface no farther than his return to Italy. His death is mentioned by Prosper and Marcellinus; the expression of the latter, that Ætius, the day before, had provided himself with a *longer* spear, implies something like a regular duel.

[3] Procop. de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 4. p. 186. Valentinian published several humane laws, to relieve the distress of his Numidian and Mauritanian subjects; he discharged them, in a great measure, from the payment of their debts, reduced their tribute to one-eighth, and gave them a right of appeal from the provincial magistrates to the Præfect of Rome. Cod. Theod. vi. Novell. p. 11.

[4] Vict. Vitensis, de Persec. Vandal. l. ii. c. 5. p. 26. The cruelties of Genseric towards his subjects, are strongly expressed in Prosper's Chron. A.D. 442.

of the Moors and Germans, the Donatists and Catholics, continually disturbed, or threatened, the unsettled reign of the conqueror. As he advanced towards Carthage, he was forced to withdraw his troops from the Western provinces; the sea-coast was exposed to the naval enterprises of the Romans of Spain and Italy; and, in the heart of Numidia, the strong inland city of Corta still persisted in obstinate independence.[1] These difficulties were gradually subdued by the spirit, the perseverance, and the cruelty of Genseric; who alternately applied the arts of peace and war to the establishment of his African kingdom. He subscribed a solemn treaty with the hope of deriving some advantage from the term of its continuance, and the moment of its violation. The vigilance of his enemies were relaxed by the protestations of friendship, which concealed his hostile approach; and Carthage was at length surprised (A.D. 439. Oct. 9) by the Vandals, five hundred and eighty-five years after the destruction of the city and republic by the younger Scipio.[2]

A new city had arisen from its ruins, with the title of a colony; and though Carthage might yield to the royal prerogatives of Constantinople, and perhaps to the trade of Alexandria, or the splendour of Antioch, she still maintained the second rank in the West; as the *Rome* (if we may use the style of contemporaries) of the African world. That wealthy and opulent metropolis[3] displayed, in a dependent condition, the image of a flourishing republic. Carthage contained the manufactures, the arms, and the treasures of the six provinces. A regular subordination of civil honours, gradually ascended from the procurators of the streets and quarters of the city, to the tribunal of the supreme magistrate, who, with the title of proconsul, represented the state and dignity of a consul of ancient Rome. Schools and *gymnasia* were instituted for the education of the African youth; and the liberal arts and manners, grammar, rhetoric, and philosophy, were publicly taught in the Greek and Latin languages. The buildings of Carthage were uniform and magnificent: a shady grove was planted in the midst of the capital; the *new* port, a secure and capacious harbour, was subservient to the commercial industry of citizens and strangers; and the splendid games of the circus and theatre were exhibited almost in the presence of the Barbarians. The reputation of the Carthaginians was not equal to that of their country, and the reproach of Punic faith still adhered to their subtle and faithless character.[4] The habits of trade, and the abuse of luxury, had corrupted their manners; but their impious contempt of monks, and the shameless practice of unnatural lusts, are the two abominations which excite

[1] Possidius, in Vit. Aug. c. 28. Ruinart, p. 428.

[2] Chron. of Idatius, Isidore, Prosper, and Marcellinus. They mark the same year, but different days, for the surprisal of Carthage.

[3] The picture of Carthage, as it flourished in the fourth and fifth centuries, is taken from the Expositio totius Mundi, p. 17. in the third volume of Hudson's Minor Geog. from Ausonius de Claris Urbibus, p. 228. ; and principally from Salvian, de Guber. Dei, l. vii. 257. I am surprised that the *Notitia* should not place either a mint, or an arsenal, at Carthage; but only a gynecæum, or female manufacture.

[4] The anonymous author of the Exposition totius Mundi, compares, in his barbarous Latin, the country and the inhabitants; and, after stigmatizing their want of faith, he coolly concludes, Difficile autem inter eos invenitur bonus, tamen in multis pauci boni esse possunt. P. 18.

the pious vehemence of Salvian, the preacher of the age.[1] The king of the Vandals severely reformed the vices of a voluptuous people; and the ancient, noble, ingenuous, freedom of Carthage (these expressions of Victor are not without energy), was reduced by Genseric into a state of ignominious servitude. After he had permitted his licentious troops to satiate their rage and avarice, he instituted a more regular system of rapine and oppression. An edict was promulgated, which enjoined all persons, without fraud or delay, to deliver their gold, silver, jewels, and valuable furniture or apparel, to the royal officers; and the attempt to secrete any part of their patrimony, was inexorably punished with death and torture, as an act of treason against the state. The lands of the proconsular province, which formed the immediate district of Carthage, were accurately measured, and divided among the Barbarians; and the conqueror reserved for his peculiar domain, the fertile territory of Byzacium, and the adjacent parts of Numidia and Getulia.[2]

It was natural enough that Genseric should hate those whom he had injured: the nobility and senators of Carthage were exposed to his jealousy and resentment; and all those who refused the ignominious terms, which their honour and religion forbade them to accept, were compelled by the Arian tyrant to embrace the condition of perpetual banishment. Rome, Italy, and the provinces of the East, were filled with a crowd of exiles, of fugitives, and of ingenuous captives, who solicited the public compassion: and the benevolent epistles of Theodoret, still preserve the names and misfortunes of Cælestian and Maria.[3] The Syrian bishop deplores the misfortunes of Cælestian, who, from the state of a noble and opulent senator of Carthage, was reduced, with his wife and family, and servants, to beg his bread in a foreign country; but he applauds the resignation of the Christian exile, and the philosophic temper, which, under the pressure of such calamities, could enjoy more real happiness, than was the ordinary lot of wealth and prosperity. The story of Maria, the daughter of the magnificent Eudæmon, is singular and interesting. In the sack of Carthage, she was purchased from the Vandals by some merchants of Syria, who afterwards sold her as a slave in their native country. A female attendant, transported in the same ship, and sold in the same family, still continued to respect a mistress whom fortune had reduced to the common level of servitude; and the daughter of Eudæmon received from her grateful affection the domestic services, which she had once required from her obedience. This remarkable behaviour divulged the real condition of Maria; who, in the absence of the bishop of Cyrrhus, was redeemed from slavery by the generosity of some soldiers of the garrison. The liberality of Theodoret provided for her decent maintenance; and she passed ten months

[1] He declares, that the peculiar vices of each country were collected in the sink of Carthage (l. vii. 257.). The streets of Carthage were polluted by effeminate wretches, who publicly assumed the countenance, the dress, and the character of women (p. 264.). If a monk appeared in the city, the holy man was pursued with impious scorn and ridicule; detestantibus ridentium cachinnis (p. 289.).

[2] Procopius de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 5. p. 189.; Victor Vitensis, de Persecut. Vandal. l. i. c. 4.

[3] Ruinart (p. 444.) has collected from Theodoret, and other authors, the misfortunes, real and fabulous, of the inhabitants of Carthage.

among the deaconesses of the church; till she was unexpectedly informed, that her father, who had escaped from the ruin of Carthage, exercised an honourable office in one of the Western provinces. Her filial impatience was seconded by the pious bishop: Theodoret, in a letter still extant, recommends Maria to the bishop of Ægæ, a maritime city of Cilicia, which was frequented, during the annual fair, by the vessels of the West; most earnestly requesting, that his colleague would use the maiden with a tenderness suitable to her birth; and that he would entrust her to the care of such faithful merchants, as would esteem it a sufficient gain, if they restored a daughter, lost beyond all human hope, to the arms of her afflicted parent.

Among the insipid legends of ecclesiastical history, I am tempted to distinguish the memorable fable of the SEVEN SLEEPERS:[1] whose imaginary date corresponds with the reign of the younger Theodosius, and the conquest of Africa by the Vandals.[2] When the emperor Decius persecuted the Christians, seven noble youths of Ephesus concealed themselves in a spacious cavern in the side of an adjacent mountain; where they were doomed to perish by the tyrant, who gave orders that the entrance should be firmly secured with a pile of huge stones. They immediately fell into a deep slumber, which was miraculously prolonged, without injuring the powers of life, during a period of 187 years. At the end of that time, the slaves of Adolius, to whom the inheritance of the mountain had descended, removed the stones, to supply materials for some rustic edifice; the light of the sun darted into the cavern, and the seven sleepers were permitted to awake. After a slumber, as they thought, of a few hours, they were pressed by the calls of hunger; and resolved that Jamblichus, one of their number, should secretly return to the city, to purchase bread for the use of his companions. The youth (if we may still employ that appellation) could no longer recognise the once familiar aspect of his native country; and his surprise was increased by the appearance of a large cross, triumphantly erected over the principal gate of Ephesus. His singular dress, and obsolete language, confounded the baker, to whom he offered an ancient medal of Decius as the current coin of the empire; and Jamblichus, on the suspicion of a secret treasure, was dragged before the judge. Their mutual enquiries produced the amazing discovery, that two centuries were almost elapsed since Jamblichus, and his friends, had escaped from the rage of a Pagan tyrant. The bishop of Ephesus, the clergy, the magistrates, the people, and as it is said the emperor Theodosius himself, hastened to visit the cavern of the Seven Sleepers; who bestowed their benediction, related their story, and at the same instant peaceably expired. The

[1] The choice of fabulous circumstances is of small importance; yet I have confined myself to the narrative which was translated from the Syriac by the care of Greg. of Tours (de Gloriâ Martyrûm, l. i. c. 95. in Max. Biblio. Patrum, xi. 856.), to the Greek acts of their martyrdom (apud Photium, p. 1400.), and to the Annals of the Patriarch Eutychius (i. 391. 531. Vers. Pocock).

[2] Two Syriac writers, as they are quoted by Assemanni (Bibliot. Orien. i. 336.), place the resurrection of the Seven Sleepers in the years 736 (A.D. 425.), or 748 (A.D. 437.), of the æra of the Seleucides. Their Greek Acts, which Photius had read, assign the date of the thirty-eighth year of the reign of Theodosius, which may coincide either with A.D. 439, or 446. The period which had elapsed since the persecution of Decius is easily ascertained; and nothing less than the ignorance of Mahomet, or the legendaries, could suppose an interval of three or four hundred years.

origin of this marvellous fable cannot be ascribed to the pious fraud and credulity of the *modern* Greeks, since the authentic tradition may be traced within half a century of the supposed miracle. James of Sarug, a Syrian bishop, who was born only two years after the death of the younger Theodosius, has devoted one of his two hundred and thirty homilies to the praise of the young men of Ephesus.[1] Their legend, before the end of the sixth century, was translated from the Syriac, into the Latin, language, by the care of Gregory of Tours. The hostile communions of the East preserve their memory with equal reverence; and their names are honourably inscribed in the Roman, the Abyssinian, and the Russian calendar.[2] Nor has their reputation been confined to the Christian world. This popular tale, which Mahomet might learn when he drove his camels to the fairs of Syria, is introduced, as a divine revelation, into the Koran.[3] The story of the Seven Sleepers has been adopted, and adorned by the nations, from Bengal to Africa, who profess the Mahometan religion;[4] and some vestiges of a similar tradition have been discovered in the remote extremities of Scandinavia.[5] This easy and universal belief, so expressive of the sense of mankind, may be ascribed to the genuine merit of the fable itself. We imperceptibly advance from youth to age, without observing the gradual, but incessant, change of human affairs; and even in our larger experience of history, the imagination is accustomed, by a perpetual series of causes and effects, to unite the most distant revolutions. But if the interval between two memorable æras could be instantly annihilated; if it were possible, after a momentary slumber of two hundred years, to display the *new* world to the eyes of a spectator, who still retained a lively and recent impression of the *old*, his surprise and his reflections would furnish the pleasing subject of a philosophical romance. The scene could not be more advantageously placed, than in the two centuries which elapsed between the reigns of Decius and of Theodosius the Younger. During this period, the seat of government had been transported from Rome to a new city on the banks of the Thracian Bosphorus; and the abuse of military spirit had been suppressed, by an artificial system of tame and ceremonious servitude. The throne of the persecuting Decius

[1] James, one of the orthodox fathers of the Syrian church, was born A.D. 452.; he began to compose his sermons A.D. 474.: he was made bishop of Batnæ, in the district of Sarug, and province of Mesopotamia, A.D. 519, and died A.D. 521. (Assemanni, tom. i. 288.) For the homily *de Pueris Ephesinis*, see p. 335.: though I could wish that Assemanni had translated the text of James of Sarug, instead of answering the objections of Baronius.

[2] *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists (Mensis Julii, vi. 375.). This immense calendar of saints, in 126 years (1644—1770.), and in fifty volumes in folio, has advanced no farther than the 7th day of October. The suppression of the Jesuits has most probably checked an undertaking, which, through the medium of fable and superstition, communicates much historical and philosophical instruction.

[3] Maracci Alcoran. Sura xviii. ii. 420. and i. part iv. 103. With such an ample privilege, Mahomet has not shown much taste or ingenuity. He has invented the dog (Al Rakim) of the Seven Sleepers; the respect of the sun, who altered his course twice a day, that he might shine into the cavern; and the care of God himself, who preserved their bodies from putrefaction, by turning them to the right and left.

[4] D'Herbelot, Biblio. Orien. p. 139.; Renaudot, Hist. Patriarch. Alexand. p. 39.

[5] Paul, the deacon of Aquileia (de Gestis Langobardorum, l. i. c. 4. p. 745. ed. Grot.), who lived towards the end of the eighth century, has placed in a cavern under a rock, on the shore of the ocean, the Seven Sleepers of the North, whose long repose was respected by the Barbarians. Their dress declared them to be Romans; and the deacon conjectures, that they were reserved by Providence as the future apostles of those unbelieving countries.

was filled by a succession of Christian and orthodox princes, who had extirpated the fabulous gods of antiquity: and the public devotion of the age was impatient to exalt the saints and martyrs of the Catholic church, on the altars of Diana and Hercules. The union of the Roman empire was dissolved: its genius was humbled in the dust; and armies of unknown Barbarians, issuing from the frozen regions of the North, had established their victorious reign over the fairest provinces of Europe and Africa.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

The Character, Conquests, and Court of Attila, King of the Huns.—Death of Theodosius the Younger.—Elevation of Marcian to the Empire of the East.

THE western world was oppressed by the Goths and Vandals, who fled before the Huns; but the achievements of the Huns themselves were not adequate to their power and prosperity. Their victorious hordes had (A.D. 376—433) spread from the Volga to the Danube; but the public force was exhausted by the discord of independent chieftains; their valour was idly consumed in obscure and predatory excursions; and they often degraded their national dignity by condescending, for the hopes of spoil, to enlist under the banners of their fugitive enemies. In the reign of ATTILA,[1] the Huns again became the terror of the world; and I shall now describe the character and actions of that formidable Barbarian; who alternately insulted and invaded the East and the West, and urged the rapid downfall of the Roman empire.

In the tide of emigration, which impetuously rolled from the confines of China to those of Germany, the most powerful and populous tribes may commonly be found on the verge of the Roman provinces. The accumulated weight was sustained for a while by artificial barriers; and the easy condescension of the emperors invited, without satisfying, the insolent demands of the Barbarians, who had acquired an eager appetite for the luxuries of civilized life. The Hungarians, who ambitiously insert the name of Attila among their native kings, may affirm with truth, that the hordes, which were subject to his uncle Roas, or Rugilas, had formed their encampments within the limits of modern Hungary,[2] in a fertile country, which liberally supplied the

[1] The authentic materials for the history of Attila may be found in Jornan. (de Reb. Get. c. 34—50. p. 660. ed. Grot.) and Priscus (Excerp. de Legat. p. 33. Paris, 1648.). I have not seen the Lives of Attila, composed by Juvencus Cælius Calanus Dalmatinus, in the twelfth century, or by Nicholas Olahus, archbishop of Gran, in the sixteenth. Mascou's Hist. of the Germans, ix. 23. and Maffei Osservaz. Litter. i. 88. Whatever the modern Hungarians have added, must be fabulous; and they do not seem to have excelled in the art of fiction. They suppose that when Attila invaded Gaul and Italy, married innumerable wives, &c. he was 120 years of age. Thwrocz Chron. p. i. c. 22. in Script. Hungar. i. 76.

[2] Hungary has been successively occupied by three Scythian colonies. 1. The Huns of Attila; 2. The Abares, in the sixth century; and, 3. the Turks or Magiars, A.D. 889.; the

wants of a nation of hunters and shepherds. In this advantageous situation, Rugilas, and his valiant brothers, who continually added to their power and reputation, commanded the alternative of peace or war with the two empires. His alliance with the Romans of the West was cemented by his personal friendship for the great Ætius; who was always secure of finding, in the Barbarian camp, a hospitable reception, and a powerful support. At his solicitation, and in the name of John the usurper, 60,000 Huns advanced to the confines of Italy; their march and their retreat were alike expensive to the state; and the grateful policy of Ætius abandoned the possession of Pannonia to his faithful confederates. The Romans of the East were not less apprehensive of the arms of Rugilas, which threatened the provinces, or even the capital. Some ecclesiastical historians have destroyed the Barbarians with lightning and pestilence;[1] but Theodosius was reduced to the more humble expedient of stipulating an annual payment of three hundred and fifty pounds of gold, and of disguising this dishonourable tribute by the title of general, which the king of the Huns condescended to accept. The public tranquillity was frequently interrupted by the fierce impatience of the Barbarians, and the perfidious intrigues of the Byzantine court. Four dependent nations, among whom we may distinguish the Bavarians, disclaimed the sovereignty of the Huns; and their revolt was encouraged and protected by a Roman alliance; till the just claims and formidable power of Rugilas, were effectually urged by the voice of Eslaw his ambassador. Peace was the unanimous wish of the senate: their decree was ratified by the emperor; and two ambassadors were named, Plinthas, a general of Scythian extraction, but of consular rank; and the quæstor Epigenes, a wise and experienced statesman, who was recommended to that office by his ambitious colleague.

The death of Rugilas suspended the progress of the treaty. His two nephews, Attila and Bleda, who succeeded (A.D. 433—453) to the throne of their uncle, consented to a personal interview with the ambassadors of Constantinople; but as they proudly refused to dismount, the business was transacted on horseback, in a spacious plain near the city of Margus, in the Upper Mæsia. The kings of the Huns assumed the solid benefits, as well as the vain honours, of the negociation. They dictated the conditions of peace, and each condition was an insult on the majesty of the empire. Besides the freedom of a safe and plentiful market on the banks of the Danube, they required that the annual contribution should be augmented from three hundred and fifty, to seven hundred pounds of gold; that a fine, or ransom, of eight pieces of gold, should be paid for every Roman captive, who had escaped from his Barbarian master; that the emperor should renounce all treaties and engagements with the enemies of the Huns; and that

immediate and genuine ancestors of the modern Hungarians, whose connexion with the two former is extremely faint and remote. The *Prodromus* and *Notitia* of Matthew Belius, appear to contain a rich fund of information concerning ancient and modern Hungary. I have seen the extracts in Biblio. Ancien. et Moderne, xxii. 1—51. and Bibliothèque Raisonnée, xvi. 127.

[1] Socr. l. vii. c. 43. Theodor. l. v. c. 36. Tillemont, who always depends on the faith of his ecclesiastical authors, strenuously contends (Hist. des Emp. vi. 136. 607.), that the wars and personages were not the same.

all the fugitives, who had taken refuge in the court, or provinces, of Theodosius, should be delivered to the justice of their offended sovereign. This justice was rigorously inflicted on some unfortunate youths of a royal race. They were crucified on the territories of the empire, by the command of Attila: and, as soon as the king of the Huns had impressed the Romans with the terror of his name, he indulged them in a short and arbitrary respite, whilst he subdued the rebellious or independent nations of Scythia and Germany.[1]

Attila, the son of Mundzuk, deduced his noble, perhaps his regal, descent[2] from the ancient Huns, who had formerly contended with the monarchs of China. His features, according to the observation of a Gothic historian, bore the stamp of his national origin; and the portrait of Attila exhibits the genuine deformity of a modern Calmuck;[3] a large head, a swarthy complexion, small deep-seated eyes, a flat nose, a few hairs in the place of a beard, broad shoulders, and a short square body, of nervous strength, though of a disproportioned form. The haughty step and demeanour of the king of the Huns expressed the consciousness of his superiority above the rest of mankind; and he had a custom of fiercely rolling his eyes, as if he wished to enjoy the terror which he inspired. Yet this savage hero was not inaccessible to pity: his suppliant enemies might confide in the assurance of peace or pardon; and Attila was considered by his subjects as a just and indulgent master. He delighted in war; but, after he had ascended the throne in a mature age, his head, rather than his hand, achieved the conquest of the North; and the fame of an adventurous soldier was usefully exchanged for that of a prudent and successful general. The effects of personal valour are so inconsiderable, except in poetry or romance, that victory, even among Barbarians, must depend upon the degree of skill, with which the passions of the multitude are combined and guided for the service of a single man. The Scythian conquerors, Attila and Zingis, surpassed their rude countrymen in art, rather than in courage; and it may be observed, that the monarchies, both of the Huns and of the Moguls, were erected by their founders on the basis of popular superstition. The miraculous conception, which fraud and credulity ascribed to the virgin-mother of Zingis, raised him above the level of human nature; and the naked prophet, who, in the name of the Deity, invested him with the empire of the earth, pointed the valour of the Moguls with irresistible enthusiasm.[4] The religious arts of Attila were not less skilfully adapted to the character of his age and country. It was natural enough, that the Scythians should adore, with peculiar devotion, the god of war; but as they were incapable of forming either an abstract idea, or a

[1] Priscus, p. 47. and Hist. des Peup. de l'Eur. vii. c. xii, xiii, xiv, xv.

[2] Priscus, p. 39. The modern Hungarians have deduced his genealogy, which ascends, in the thirty-fifth degree, to Ham the son of Noah; yet they are ignorant of his father's real name (de Guignes, Hist. des Huns, ii. 297.).

[3] Compare Jornan. (c. 35. p. 661.) with Buffon, Hist. Natur. iii. 380. The former had a right to observe, originis suæ signa restituens. The character and portrait of Attila are probably transcribed from Cassiodorus.

[4] Abulpharag. Dynast. vers. Pocock, p. 281. Genealogical History of the Tartars, by Abulghazi Bahader Khan, part iii. c. 15. part iv. c. 3. Vie de Gengiscan, par Petit de la Croix, l. i. c. 1. 6. The relations of the missionaries, who visited Tartary in the thirteenth century (vol. vii. Hist. des Voyages), express the popular language and opinions; Zingis is styled the Son of God, &c. &c.

corporeal representation, they worshipped their tutelar deity under the symbol of an iron cimeter.[1] One of the shepherds of the Huns perceived, that a heifer, who was grazing, had wounded herself in the foot, and curiously followed the track of the blood, till he discovered, among the long grass, the point of an ancient sword; which he dug out of the ground, and presented to Attila. That magnanimous, or rather that artful, prince accepted, with pious gratitude, this celestial favour; and, as the rightful possessor of the *sword of Mars*, asserted his divine and indefeasible claim to the dominion of the earth.[2] If the rites of Scythia were practised on this solemn occasion, a lofty altar, or rather pile of faggots, 300 yards in length and in breadth, was raised in a spacious plain; and the sword of Mars was placed erect on the summit of this rustic altar, which was annually consecrated by the blood of sheep, horses, and of the 100th captive.[3] Whether human sacrifices formed any part of the worship of Attila, or whether he propitiated the god of war with the victims which he continually offered in the field of battle, the favourite of Mars soon acquired a sacred character, which rendered his conquests more easy, and more permanent; and the Barbarian princes confessed, in the language of devotion or flattery, that they could not presume to gaze, with a steady eye, on the divine majesty of the king of the Huns.[4] His brother Bleda, who reigned over a considerable part of the nation, was compelled to resign his sceptre, and his life. Yet even this cruel act was attributed to a supernatural impulse; and the vigour with which Attila wielded the sword of Mars, convinced the world, that it had been reserved alone for his invincible arm.[5] But the extent of his empire affords the only remaining evidence of the number, and importance, of his victories; and the Scythian monarch, however ignorant of the value of science and philosophy, might, perhaps, lament, that his illiterate subjects were destitute of the art which could perpetuate the memory of his exploits.

If a line of separation were drawn between the civilized and the savage climates of the globe; between the inhabitants of cities, who cultivated the earth, and the hunters and shepherds, who dwelt in tents; Attila might aspire to the title of supreme and sole monarch of the Barbarians.[6] He alone, among the conquerors of ancient and

[1] Nec templum apud eos visitur, aut delubrum, ne tugurium quidum culmo tectum cerni usquam potest; sed *gladius* Barbarico ritû humi figitur nudus, eumque ut Martem regionum quas circumcircant præsulem verecundius colunt. Ammian. xxxi. 2. and the learned Notes of Lindenbrogius and Valesius.

[2] Priscus relates this remarkable story, both in his own text (p. 65.), and in the quotation made by Jornan. (c. 35. p. 662.). He might have explained the tradition, or fable, which characterized this famous sword, and the name as well as attributes of the Scythian deity, whom he has translated into the Mars of the Greeks and Romans.

[3] Herodot. l. iv. c. 62. For the sake of economy, I have calculated by the smallest stadium. In the human sacrifices, they cut off the shoulder and arm of the victim, which they threw up into the air, and drew omens and presages from the manner of their falling on the pile.

[4] Priscus, p. 55. A more civilized hero, Augustus himself, was pleased, if the person on whom he fixed his eyes seemed unable to support their divine lustre. Suetonius in Aug. c. 79.

[5] De Buat (Hist. des Peup. de l'Eur. vii. 428.) attempts to clear Attila from the murder of his brother; and is almost inclined to reject the concurrent testimony of Jornandes, and the contemporary Chronicles.

[6] Fortissimarum gentium dominus, qui inauditâ ante se potentiâ, solus Scythica et Ger-

modern times, united the two mighty kingdoms of Germany and Scythia; and those vague appellations, when they are applied to his reign, may be understood with an ample latitude. Thuringia, which stretched beyond its actual limits as far as the Danube, was in the number of his provinces: he interposed, with the weight of a powerful neighbour, in the domestic affairs of the Franks; and one of his lieutenants chastised, and almost exterminated, the Burgundians of the Rhine. He subdued the islands of the ocean, the kingdoms of Scandinavia, encompassed and divided by the waters of the Baltic; and the Huns might derive a tribute of furs from that northern region, which has been protected from all other conquerors by the severity of the climate, and the courage of the natives. Towards the East, it is difficult to circumscribe the dominion of Attila over the Scythian deserts; yet we may be assured, that he reigned on the banks of the Volga; that the king of the Huns was dreaded, not only as a warrior, but as a magician;[1] that he insulted and vanquished the Khan of the formidable Geougen; and that he sent ambassadors to negociate an equal alliance with the empire of China. In the proud review of the nations who acknowledged the sovereignty of Attila, and who never entertained, during his lifetime, the thought of a revolt, the Gepidæ and the Ostrogoths were distinguished by their numbers, their bravery, and the personal merit of their chiefs. The renowned Ardaric, king of the Gepidæ, was the faithful and sagacious counsellor of the monarch, who esteemed his intrepid genius, whilst he loved the mild and discreet virtues of the noble Walamir, king of the Ostrogoths. The crowd of vulgar kings, the leaders of so many martial tribes, who served under the standard of Attila, were ranged in the submissive order of guards and domestics, round the person of their master. They watched his nod; they trembled at his frown; and, at the first signal of his will, they executed, without murmur or hesitation, his stern and absolute commands. In time of peace, the dependent princes, with their national troops, attended the royal camp in regular succession; but when Attila collected his military force, he was able to bring into the field an army of five, or according to another account, of 700,000 Barbarians.[2]

The ambassadors of the Huns might awaken the attention of Theodosius, by reminding him, that they were his neighbours both in Europe and Asia; since they touched the Danube on one hand, and reached, with the other, as far as the Tanais. In the reign of his father Arcadius, a band of adventurous Huns had (A.D. 430—440)

manica regna possedit. Jornan. c. 49. p, 684. Priscus, p. 64. M. de Guignes, by his knowledge of the Chinese, has acquired (ii. 295.) an adequate idea of the empire of Attila.

[1] Hist. des Huns, ii. 296. The Geougen believed that the Huns could excite, at pleasure, storms of wind and rain. This phenomenon was produced by the stone *Gezi;* to whose magic power the loss of a battle was ascribed by the Mahometan Tartars of the fourteenth century. Cherefeddin Ali, Hist. de Timur Bec, i. 82.

[2] Jornan. c. 35. p. 661. c. 37. p. 667. Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. vi. 129. Corneille has represented the pride of Attila to his subject kings; and his tragedy opens with these two ridiculous lines:

> Ils ne sont pas venus, nos deux rois ! qu'on leur die
> Qu'ils se sont trop attendre, et qu' Attila s'ennuie.

The two kings of the Gepidæ and the Ostrogoths are profound politicians and sentimental lovers: and the whole piece exhibits the defects, without the genius, of the poet.

ravaged the provinces of the East; from whence they brought away rich spoils and innumerable captives.[1] They advanced, by a secret path, along the shores of the Caspian sea; traversed the snowy mountains of Armenia; passed the Tigris, the Euphrates, and the Halys; recruited their weary cavalry with the generous breed of Cappadocian horses; occupied the hilly country of Cilicia, and disturbed the festal songs, and dances, of the citizens of Antioch. Egypt trembled at their approach; and the monks and pilgrims of the Holy Land prepared to escape their fury by a speedy embarkation. The memory of this invasion was still recent in the minds of the Orientals. The subjects of Attila might execute, with superior forces, the design which these adventurers had so boldly attempted; and it soon became the subject of anxious conjecture, whether the tempest would fall on the dominions of Rome, or of Persia. Some of the great vassals of the king of the Huns, who were themselves in the rank of powerful princes, had been sent to ratify an alliance and society of arms with the emperor, or rather with the general, of the West. They related, during their residence at Rome, the circumstances of an expedition, which they had lately made into the East. After passing a desert and a morass, supposed by the Romans to be the lake Mœotis, they penetrated through the mountains, and arrived, at the end of fifteen days' march, on the confines of Media; where they advanced as far as the unknown cities of Basic and Cursic. They encountered the Persian army in the plains of Media; and the air, according to their own expression, was darkened by a cloud of arrows. But the Huns were obliged to retire, before the numbers of the enemy. Their laborious retreat was effected by a different road; they lost the greatest part of their booty; and at length returned to the royal camp, with some knowledge of the country, and an impatient desire of revenge. In the free conversation of the Imperial ambassadors, who discussed, at the court of Attila, the character and designs of their formidable enemy, the ministers of Constantinople expressed their hope, that his strength might be diverted and employed in a long and doubtful contest with the princes of the house of Sassan. The more sagacious Italians admonished their Eastern brethren of the folly and danger of such a hope; and convinced them, *that* the Medes and Persians were incapable of resisting the arms of the Huns; and, *that* the easy and important acquisition would exalt the pride, as well as power, of the conqueror. Instead of contenting himself with a moderate contribution, and a military title, which equalled him only to the generals of Theodosius, Attila would proceed to impose a disgraceful and intolerable yoke on the necks of the prostrate and captive Romans,

[1] ———alii per Caspia claustra
Armeniasque nives, inopino tramite ducti
Invadunt Orientis opes: jam pascua fumant
Cappadocum, volucrumque parens Argæus equorum.
Jam rubet altus Halys, nec se defendit iniquo
Monte Cilix; Syriæ tractus vastantur amæni;
Assuetumque choris et lætâ plebe canorum
Proterit imbellem sonipes hostilis Orontem.
Claudian, in Rufin. l. ii. 28—35.

Eutrop. l. 1. 243. and the strong description of Jerom, who wrote from his feelings, i. 26. ad Heliodor. p. 200. ad Ocean. Philostorg. (l. ix. c. 8.) mentions this irruption.

who would then be encompassed, on all sides, by the empire of the Huns.—See the original conversation in *Priscus*, p. 64.

While the powers of Europe and Asia were solicitous to avert the impending danger, the alliance of Attila maintained (A.D. 441) the Vandals in the possession of Africa. An enterprise had been concerted between the courts of Ravenna and Constantinople, for the recovery of that valuable province; and the ports of Sicily were already filled with the military and naval forces of Theodosius. But the subtle Genseric, who spread his negociations round the world, prevented their designs, by exciting the king of the Huns to invade the Eastern empire; and a trifling incident soon became the motive, or pretence, of a destructive war.[1] Under the faith of the treaty of Margus, a free market was held on the northern side of the Danube, which was protected by a Roman fortress, surnamed Constantia. A troop of Barbarians violated the commercial security; killed, or dispersed, the unsuspecting traders; and levelled the fortress with the ground. The Huns justified this outrage as an act of reprisal; alleged, that the bishop of Margus had entered their territories, to discover and steal a secret treasure of their kings; and sternly demanded the guilty prelate, the sacrilegious spoil, and the fugitive subjects, who had escaped from the justice of Attila. The refusal of the Byzantine court was the signal of war; and the Mæsians at first applauded the generous firmness of their sovereign. But they were soon intimidated by the destruction of Viminiacum and the adjacent towns; and the people was persuaded to adopt the convenient maxim, that a private citizen, however innocent or respectable, may be justly sacrificed to the safety of his country. The bishop of Margus, who did not possess the spirit of a martyr, resolved to prevent the designs which he suspected. He boldly treated with the princes of the Huns; secured, by solemn oaths, his pardon and reward; posted a numerous detachment of Barbarians, in silent ambush, on the banks of the Danube; and, at the appointed hour, opened, with his own hand, the gates of his episcopal city. This advantage, which had been obtained by treachery, served as a prelude to more honourable and decisive victories. The Illyrian frontier was covered by a line of castles and fortresses; and though the greatest part of them consisted only of a single tower, with a small garrison, they were commonly sufficient to repel, or to intercept, the inroads of an enemy, who was ignorant of the art, and impatient of the delay, of a regular siege. But these slight obstacles were instantly swept away by the inundation of the Huns.[2] They destroyed, with fire and sword, the populous cities of Sirmium and Singidunum, of Ratiaria and Marcianapolis, of Naissus and Sardica; where every circumstance, in

[1] Priscus, p. 331. His history contained a copious and elegant account of the war (Evag. l. i. c. 17.); but the extracts which relate to the embassies are the only parts that have reached our times. The original work was accessible, however, to the writers, from whom we borrow our imperfect knowledge, Jornan., Theophan., Marcellinus, Prosper-Tyro, and the author of the Alexandrian, or Paschal, Chronicle. De Buat (Hist. des Peup. de l'Eur. vii. c. xv.) has examined the cause, the circumstances, and the duration, of this war; and will not allow it to extend beyond the year four hundred and forty-four.

[2] Procop. de Edif. l. iv. c. 5. These fortresses were afterwards restored, strengthened, and enlarged by the emperor Justinian; but they were soon destroyed by the Abares, who succeeded to the power and possessions of the Huns.

the discipline of the people, and the construction of the buildings, had been gradually adapted to the sole purpose of defence. The whole breadth of Europe, as it extends above five hundred miles from the Euxine to the Hadriatic, was at once invaded, and occupied, and desolated, by the myriads of Barbarians whom Attila led into the field. The public danger and distress could not, however, provoke Theodosius to interrupt his amusements and devotion, or to appear in person at the head of the Roman legions. But the troops, which had been sent against Genseric, were hastily recalled from Sicily; the garrisons, on the side of Persia, were exhausted; and a military force was collected in Europe, formidable by their arms and numbers, if the generals had understood the science of command, and their soldiers the duty of obedience. The armies of the Eastern empire were vanquished in three successive engagements; and the progress of Attila may be traced by the fields of battle. The two former, on the banks of the Utus, and under the walls of Marcianapolis, were fought in the extensive plains between the Danube and Mount Hæmus. As the Romans were pressed by a victorious enemy, they gradually, and unskilfully, retired towards the Chersonesus of Thrace; and that narrow peninsula, the last extremity of the land, was marked by their third, and irreparable, defeat. By the destruction of this army, Attila acquired the indisputable possession of the field. From the Hellespont to Thermopylæ, and the suburbs of Constantinople, he ravaged, without resistance, and without mercy, the provinces of Thrace and Macedonia. Heraclea and Hadrianople might, perhaps, escape this dreadful irruption of the Huns; but the words, the most expressive of total extirpation and erasure, are applied to the calamities which they inflicted on seventy cities of the Eastern empire.[1] Theodosius, his court, and the unwarlike people, were protected by the walls of Constantinople; but those walls had been shaken by a recent earthquake, and the fall of fifty-eight towers had opened a large and tremendous breach. The damage indeed was speedily repaired; but this accident was aggravated by a superstitious fear, that Heaven itself had delivered the Imperial city to the shepherds of Scythia, who were strangers to the laws, the language, and the religion, of the Romans.[2]

In all their invasions of the civilized empires of the South, the Scythian shepherds have been uniformly actuated by a savage and destructive spirit. The laws of war, that restrain the exercise of national rapine and murder, are founded on two principles of substantial interest: the knowledge of the permanent benefits which may be obtained by a moderate use of conquest; and a just apprehension, lest the desolation which we inflict on the enemy's country, may be retaliated on our own. But these considerations of hope and fear are almost unknown in the pastoral state of nations. The Huns of Attila may, without injustice, be compared to the Moguls and Tartars, before their

[1] Septuaginta civitates (says Prosper-Tyro) deprædatione vastatæ. The language of count Marcellinus is still more forcible. Pene totam Europam, invasis *excisisque* civitatibus atque castellis, *conrasit*.

[2] Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. vi. 106.) has paid great attention to this memorable earthquake; which was felt as far from Constantinople as Antioch and Alexandria, and is celebrated by all the ecclesiastical writers.

primitive manners were changed by religion and luxury; and the evidence of Oriental history may reflect some light on the short and imperfect annals of Rome. After the Moguls had subdued the northern provinces of China, it was seriously proposed, not in the hour of victory and passion, but in calm deliberate council, to exterminate all the inhabitants of that populous country, that the vacant land might be converted to the pasture of cattle. The firmness of a Chinese mandarin,[1] who insinuated some principles of rational policy into the mind of Zingis, diverted him from the execution of this horrid design. But in the cities of Asia, which yielded to the Moguls, the inhuman abuse of the rights of war was exercised, with a regular form of discipline, which may, with equal reason, though not with equal authority, be imputed to the victorious Huns. The inhabitants, who had submitted to their discretion, were ordered to evacuate their houses, and to assemble in some plain adjacent to the city; where a division was made of the vanquished into three parts. The first class consisted of the soldiers of the garrison, and of the young men capable of bearing arms; and their fate was instantly decided: they were either enlisted among the Moguls, or they were massacred on the spot by the troops, who, with pointed spears and bended bows, had formed a circle round the captive multitude. The second class, composed of the young and beautiful women, of the artificers of every rank and profession, and of the more wealthy or honourable citizens, from whom a private ransom might be expected, was distributed in equal or proportionable lots. The remainder, whose life or death was alike useless to the conquerors, were permitted to return to the city; which, in the mean while, had been stripped of its valuable furniture; and a tax was imposed on those wretched inhabitants for the indulgence of breathing their native air. Such was the behaviour of the Moguls, when they were not conscious of any extraordinary rigour.[2] But the most casual provocation, the slightest motive, of caprice or convenience, often provoked them to involve a whole people in an indiscriminate massacre: and the ruin of some flourishing cities was executed with such unrelenting perseverance, that, according to their own expression, horses might run, without stumbling, over the ground where they had once stood. The three great capitals of Khorasan, Maru, Neisabour, and Herat, were destroyed by the armies of Zingis; and the exact account, which was taken of the slain, amounted to 4,347,000 persons.[3] Timur, or Tamerlane, was educated in a less barbarous age, and in the pro ession of the Mahometan religion: yet if Attila equalled the hostile ravages of Tam-

[1] He represented, to the emperor of the Moguls, that the four provinces (Petcheli, Chantong, Chansi, and Leaotong) which he already possessed, might annually produce, under a mild administration, 500,000 ounces of silver, 400,000 measures of rice, and 800,000 pieces of silk. Gaubil. Hist. de la Dynastie des Mongous, p. 58. Yelutchousay (such was the name of the mandarin) was a wise and virtuous minister, who saved his country, and civilized the conquerors, p. 102.

[2] Particular instances would be endless; but the curious reader may consult the Life of Gengiscan, by Petit de la Croix, Hist. des Mongous, and Book xv. Hist. of the Huns.

[3] At Maru, 1,300,000; at Herat, 1,600,000; at Neisabour, 1,747,000. D'Herbelot, Biblio. Orien. p. 380. I use the orthography of d'Anville's maps. It must however be allowed, that the Persians were disposed to exaggerate their losses, and the Moguls, to magnify their exploits.

erlane,[1] either the Tartar or the Hun might deserve the epithet of the SCOURGE OF GOD.[2]

It may be affirmed, with bolder assurance, that the Huns depopulated the provinces of the empire, by the number of Roman subjects whom they led away into captivity. In the hands of a wise legislator, such an industrious colony might have contributed to diffuse, through the deserts of Scythia, the rudiments of the useful and ornamental arts; but these captives, who had been taken in war, were accidentally dispersed among the hordes, that obeyed the empire, of Attila. The estimate of their respective value was formed by the simple judgment of unenlightened, and unprejudiced, Barbarians. They respected the ministers of every religion; and the active zeal of the Christian missionaries, without approaching the person, or the palace, of the monarch, successfully laboured in the propagation of the gospel.[3] The pastoral tribes, who were ignorant of the distinction of landed property, must have disregarded the use, as well as the abuse, of civil jurisprudence; and the skill of an eloquent lawyer could excite only their contempt, or their abhorrence.[4] The perpetual intercourse of the Huns and the Goths had communicated the familiar knowledge of the two national dialects; and the Barbarians were ambitious of conversing in Latin, the military idiom, even of the Eastern empire.[5] But they disdained the language, and the sciences, of the Greeks; and the vain sophist, or grave philosopher, who had enjoyed the flattering applause of the schools, was mortified to find, that his robust servant was a captive of more value and importance than himself. The mechanic arts were encouraged and esteemed, as they tended to satisfy the wants of the Huns. An architect, in the service of Onegesius, one of the favourites of Attila, was employed to construct a bath; but this work was a rare example of private luxury; and the trades of the smith, the carpenter, the armourer, were much more adapted to supply a wandering people with the useful instruments of peace and war. But the merit of the physician was received with universal favour and respect; the Barbarians, who despised death, might be apprehensive of disease; and the haughty conqueror trembled in the presence of a captive, to

[1] Cherefeddin Ali, his servile panegyrist, would afford us many horrid examples. In his camp before Delhi, Timur massacred 100,000 Indian prisoners, who had *smiled* when the army of their countrymen appeared in sight (Hist. de Timur Bec, iii. 90.). The people of Ispahan supplied 70,000 human skulls for the structure of several lofty towers (id. i. 434.). A similar tax was levied on the revolt of Bagdad (iii. 370.); and the exact account, which Cherefeddin was not able to procure from the proper officers, is stated by another historian (Ahmed Arabsiada, ii. 175. vers. Manger) at 90,000 heads.

[2] The ancients, Jornandes, Priscus, &c. are ignorant of this epithet. The modern Hungarians have imagined, that it was applied, by a hermit of Gaul, to Attila, who was pleased to insert it among the titles of his royal dignity. Mascou, ix. 23. and Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. vi. 143.

[3] The missionaries of St. Chrysostom had converted great numbers of the Scythians, who dwelt beyond the Danube, in tents and waggons. Theodor. l. v. c. 31. Photius, p. 1517. The Mahometans, the Nestorians, and the Latin Christians, thought themselves secure of gaining the sons and grandsons of Zingis, who treated the riyal missionaries with impartial favour.

[4] The Germans, who exterminated Varus and his legions, had been particularly offended with the Roman laws and lawyers. One of the Barbarians, after the effectual precautions of cutting out the tongue of an advocate, and sewing up his mouth, observed, with much satisfaction, that the viper could no longer hiss. Florus, iv. 12.

[5] Priscus, p. 59. It should seem that the Huns preferred the Gothic and Latin languages to their own; which was probably a harsh and barren idiom.

whom he ascribed, perhaps, an imaginary power, of prolonging, or preserving, his life.[1] The Huns might be provoked to insult the misery of their slaves, over whom they exercised a despotic command;[2] but their manners were not susceptible of a refined system of oppression; and the efforts of courage and diligence were often recompensed by the gift of freedom. The historian Priscus, whose embassy is a source of curious instruction, was accosted, in the camp of Attila, by a stranger, who saluted him in the Greek language, but whose dress and figure displayed the appearance of a wealthy Scythian. In the siege of Viminiacum, he had lost, according to his own account, his fortune and liberty: he became the slave of Onegesius; but his faithful services, against the Romans and the Acatzires, had gradually raised him to the rank of the native Huns; to whom he was attached by the domestic pledges of a new wife and several children. The spoils of war had restored and improved his private property; he was admitted to the table of his former lord; and the apostate Greek blessed the hour of his captivity, since it had been the introduction to an happy and independent state; which he held by the honourable tenure of military service. This reflection naturally produced a dispute on the advantages, and defects, of the Roman government, which was severely arraigned by the apostate, and defended by Priscus in a prolix and feeble declamation. The freedman of Onegesius exposed, in true and lively colours, the vices of a declining empire, of which he had so long been the victim; the cruel absurdity of the Roman princes, unable to protect their subjects against the public enemy, unwilling to trust them with arms for their own defence; the intolerable weight of taxes, rendered still more oppressive by the intricate or arbitrary modes of collection; the obscurity of numerous and contradictory laws; the tedious and expensive forms of judicial proceedings; the partial administration of justice; and the universal corruption, which increased the influence of the rich, and aggravated the misfortunes of the poor. A sentiment of patriotic sympathy was at length revived in the breast of the fortunate exile; and he lamented, with a flood of tears, the guilt or weakness of those magistrates, who had perverted the wisest and most salutary institutions.[3]

The timid, or selfish, policy of the Western Romans had (A. D. 446) abandoned the Eastern empire to the Huns.[4] The loss of armies, and the want of discipline, or virtue, were not supplied by the personal character of the monarch. Theodosius might still affect the style, as well as the title, of *Invincible Augustus;* but he was reduced to solicit the clemency of Attila, who imperiously dictated these harsh and humiliating conditions of peace. I. The emperor of the East resigned, by

[1] Philip de Comines, in his admirable picture of the last moments of Lewis XI. (Mem. l. vi. c. 12.) represents the insolence of his physician, who, in five months, extorted 54,000 crowns, and a rich bishopric, from the stern avaricious tyrant.

[2] Priscus (p. 61.) extols the equity of the Roman laws, which protected the life of a slave. Occidere solent non disciplinâ et severitate, sed impetu et irâ, ut inimicum, nisi quòd impune. Tacitus, De Moribus Germ. c. 25. The Heruli, who were the subjects of Attila, claimed, and exercised, the power of life and death over their slaves. See a remarkable instance in the second book of Agathias.

[3] See the whole conversation in Priscus, p. 59—62.

[4] Nova iterum Orienti assurgit ruina . . . . quum nulla ab Occidentalibus ferrentur auxilia. Prosper-Tyro composed his Chronicle in the West; and his observation implies a censure

an express or tacit convention, an extensive and important territory, which stretched along the southern banks of the Danube, from Singidunum or Belgrade, as far as Novæ, in the diocese of Thrace. The breadth was defined by the vague computation of fifteen days' journey; but, from the proposal of Attila, to remove the situation of the national market, it soon appeared, that he comprehended the ruined city of Naissus within the limits of his dominions. II. The king of the Huns required and obtained, that his tribute or subsidy should be augmented from 700 hundred pounds of gold to the annual sum of 2100; and he stipulated the immediate payment of 6000 pounds of gold to defray the expences, or to expiate the guilt, of the war. One might imagine, that such a demand, which scarcely equalled the measure of private wealth, would have been readily discharged by the opulent empire of the East; and the public distress affords a remarkable proof of the impoverished, or at least of the disorderly, state of the finances. A large proportion of the taxes, extorted from the people, was detained and intercepted in their passage, through the foulest channels, to the treasury of Constantinople. The revenue was dissipated by Theodosius, and his favourites, in wasteful and profuse luxury; which was disguised by the names of Imperial magnificence, or Christian charity. The immediate supplies had been exhausted by the unforeseen necessity of military preparations. A personal contribution, rigorously, but capriciously, imposed on the members of the senatorian order, was the only expedient that could disarm, without loss of time, the impatient avarice of Attila: and the poverty of the nobles compelled them to adopt the scandalous resource of exposing to public auction the jewels of their wives, and the hereditary ornaments of their palaces.[1] III. The king of the Huns appears to have established, as a principle of national jurisprudence, that he could never lose the property, which he had once acquired, in the persons, who had yielded either a voluntary, or reluctant, submission to his authority. From this principle he concluded, and the conclusions of Attila were irrevocable laws, that the Huns, who had been taken prisoners in war, should be released without delay, and without ransom; that every Roman captive, who had presumed to escape, should purchase his right to freedom at the price of twelve pieces of gold; and that all the Barbarians, who had deserted the standard of Attila, should be restored, without any promise, or stipulation, of pardon. In the execution of this cruel and ignominious treaty, the Imperial officers were forced to massacre several loyal and noble deserters, who refused to devote themselves to certain death; and the Romans forfeited all reasonable claims to the friendship of any Scythian people, by this public confession, that they were destitute either of faith, or power, to protect the suppliants, who had embraced the throne of Theodosius.[2]

[1] According to the description, or rather invective, of Chrysostom, an auction of Byzantine luxury must have been very productive. Every wealthy house possessed a semicircular table of massy silver, such as two men could scarcely lift, a vase of solid gold of the weight of forty pounds, cups, dishes of the same metal, &c.

[2] The articles of the treaty, expressed without much order or precision, may be found in Priscus (p. 34, &c.). Marcellinus dispenses some comfort, by observing, 1st. *That* Attila himself solicited the peace and presents, which he had formerly refused, and 2dly, *That*, about the same time, the ambassadors of India presented a fine large tame tyger to the emperor Theodosius.

The firmness of a single town, so obscure, that, except on this occasion, it has never been mentioned by any historian or geographer, exposed the disgrace of the emperor and empire. Azimus, or Azimuntium, a small city of Thrace on the Illyrian borders,[1] had been distinguished by the martial spirit of its youth, the skill and reputation of the leaders whom they had chosen, and their daring exploits against the innumerable host of the Barbarians. Instead of tamely expecting their approach, the Azimuntines attacked, in frequent and successful sallies, the troops of the Huns, who gradually declined the dangerous neighbourhood; rescued from their hands the spoil and the captives, and recruited their domestic force by the voluntary association of fugitives and deserters. After the conclusion of the treaty, Attila still menaced the empire with implacable war, unless the Azimuntines were persuaded, or compelled, to comply with the conditions which their sovereign had accepted. The ministers of Theodosius confessed with shame, and with truth, that they no longer possessed any authority over a society of men, who so bravely asserted their natural independence; and the king of the Huns condescended to negociate an equal exchange with the citizens of Azimus. They demanded the restitution of some shepherds, who, with their cattle, had been accidentally surprised. A strict, though fruitless, inquiry was allowed: but the Huns were obliged to swear that they did not detain any prisoners belonging to the city, before they could recover two surviving countrymen, whom the Azimuntines had reserved as pledges for the safety of their lost companions. Attila, on his side, was satisfied, and deceived, by their solemn asseveration, that the rest of the captives had been put to the sword; and that it was their constant practice, immediately to dismiss the Romans and the deserters, who had obtained the security of the public faith. This prudent and officious dissimulation may be condemned, or excused, by the casuists, as they incline to the rigid decree of St. Augustin, or to the milder sentiment of St. Jerom and St. Chrysostom: but every soldier, every statesmen, must acknowledge, that, if the race of the Azimuntines had been encouraged and multiplied, the Barbarians would have ceased to trample on the majesty of the empire.

It would have been strange, indeed, if Theodosius had purchased, by the loss of honour, a secure and solid tranquillity; or if his tameness had not invited the repetition of injuries. The Byzantine court was insulted by five or six successive embassies;[2] and the ministers of Attila were uniformly instructed to press the tardy or imperfect execution of the last treaty; to produce the names of fugitives and deserters, who were still protected by the empire; and to declare, with seeming moderation, that unless their sovereign obtained complete and immediate satisfaction, it would be impossible for him, were

[1] Priscus, p. 35. Among 182 forts, or castles, of Thrace, enumerated by Procop. (de Edif. l. iv. c. xi. ii. 92. ed. Paris), there is one of the name of *Esimontou*, whose position is doubtfully marked, in the neighbourhood of Anchialus, and the Euxine Sea. The name and walls of Azimuntium might subsist till the reign of Justinian; but the race of its brave defenders had been carefully extirpated by the jealousy of the Roman princes.

[2] Montesq. (Consid. sur la Grand. &c. c. xix.) has delineated, with a bold and easy pencil, some of the most striking circumstances of the pride of Attila, and the disgrace of the Romans. He deserves the praise of having read the Fragments of Priscus, which have been too much disregarded.

it even his wish, to check the resentment of his warlike tribes. Besides the motives of pride and interest, which might prompt the king of the Huns to continue this train of negociation, he was influenced by the less honourable view of enriching his favourites at the expence of his enemies. The Imperial treasury was exhausted, to procure the friendly offices of the ambassadors, and their principal attendants, whose favourable report might conduce to the maintenance of peace. The Barbarian monarch was flattered by the liberal reception of his ministers; he computed with pleasure the value and splendour of their gifts, rigorously exacted the performance of every promise, which would contribute to their private emolument, and treated as an important business of state, the marriage of his secretary Constantius.[1] That Gallic adventurer, who was recommended by Ætius to the king of the Huns, had engaged his service to the ministers of Constantinople, for the stipulated reward of a wealthy and noble wife; and the daughter of count Saturninus was chosen to discharge the obligations of her country. The reluctance of the victim, some domestic troubles, and the unjust confiscation of her fortune, cooled the ardour of her interested lover; but he still demanded, in the name of Attila, an equivalent alliance; and, after many ambiguous delays and excuses, the Byzantine court was compelled to sacrifice to this insolent stranger the widow of Armatius, whose birth, opulence, and beauty, placed her in the most illustrious rank of the Roman matrons. For these importunate and oppressive embassies, Attila claimed a suitable return: he weighed, with suspicious pride, the character and station of the Imperial envoys; but he condescended to promise, that he would advance as far as Sardica, to receive any ministers who had been invested with the consular dignity. The council of Theodosius eluded this proposal, by representing the desolate and ruined condition of Sardica; and even ventured to insinuate, that every officer of the army or household was qualified to treat with the most powerful princes of Scythia. Maximin,[2] a respectable courtier, whose abilities had been long exercised in civil and military employments, accepted with reluctance the troublesome, and, perhaps, dangerous commission, of reconciling the angry spirit of the king of the Huns. His friend, the historian Priscus,[3] embraced the opportunity of observing the Barbarian hero in the peaceful and domestic scenes of life: but the secret of the embassy, a fatal and guilty secret, was entrusted only to the interpreter Vigilius. The two last ambassadors of the Huns, Orestes, a noble subject of the Pannonian province, and Edecon, a valiant chief-

[1] Priscus, p. 69, &c. I would fain believe, that this adventurer was afterwards crucified by the order of Attila, on a suspicion of treasonable practices; but Priscus (p. 57.) has too plainly distinguished *two* persons of the name of Constantius, who, from the similar events of their lives, might have been easily confounded.

[2] In the Persian treaty concluded in the year 422, the wise and eloquent Maximin had been the assessor of Ardaburius (Socrates, l. vii. c. 20.). When Marcian ascended the throne, the office of Great Chamberlain was bestowed on Maximin, who is ranked, in a public edict, among the four principal ministers of state (Novell. ad Calc. Cod. Theod. p. 31.). He executed a civil and military commission in the Eastern provinces; and his death was lamented by the savages of Æthiopia, whose incursions he had repressed. Priscus, p. 40.

[3] Priscus was a native of Panium in Thrace, and deserved, by his eloquence, an honourable place among the sophists of the age. His Byzantine history, which related to his own times, was comprised in seven books. Fabric. Biblio. Græc. vi. 235. Notwithstanding the charitable judgment of the critics, I suspect that Priscus was a Pagan.

tain of the tribe of the Scyrri, returned at the same time from Constantinople to the royal camp. Their obscure names were afterwards illustrated by the extraordinary fortune and the contrast of their sons; the two servants of Attila became the fathers of the last Roman emperor of the West, and of the first Barbarian king of Italy.

The ambassadors, who were followed (A. D. 448) by a numerous train of men and horses, made their first halt at Sardica, at the distance of 350 miles, or thirteen days' journey, from Constantinople. As the remains of Sardica were still included within the limits of the empire, it was incumbent on the Romans to exercise the duties of hospitality. They provided, with the assistance of the provincials, a sufficient number of sheep and oxen; and invited the Huns to a splendid, or, at least, a plentiful, supper. But the harmony of the entertainment was soon disturbed by mutual prejudice and indiscretion. The greatness of the emperor and the empire was warmly maintained by their ministers; the Huns, with equal ardour, asserted the superiority of their victorious monarch: the dispute was inflamed by the rash and unseasonable flattery of Vigilius, who passionately rejected the comparison of a mere mortal with the divine Theodosius; and it was with extreme difficulty that Maximin and Priscus were able to divert the conversation, or to soothe the angry minds, of the Barbarians. When they rose from table, the Imperial ambassador presented Edecon and Orestes with rich gifts of silk robes and Indian pearls, which they thankfully accepted. Yet Orestes could not forbear insinuating, that *he* had not always been treated with such respect and liberality: and the offensive distinction, which was implied, between his civil office and the hereditary rank of his colleague, seems to have made Edecon a doubtful friend, and Orestes an irreconcileable enemy. After this entertainment, they travelled about one hundred miles from Sardica to Naissus. That flourishing city, which had given birth to the great Constantine, was levelled with the ground: the inhabitants were destroyed, or dispersed; and the appearance of some sick persons, who were still permitted to exist among the ruins of the churches, served only to increase the horror of the prospect. The surface of the country was covered with the bones of the slain; and the ambassadors, who directed their course to the north-west, were obliged to pass the hills of modern Servia, before they descended into the flat and marshy grounds, which are terminated by the Danube. The Huns were masters of the great river: their navigation was performed in large canoes, hollowed out of the trunk of a single tree; the ministers of Theodosius were safely landed on the opposite bank; and their Barbarian associates immediately hastened to the camp of Attila, which was equally prepared for the amusements of hunting or of war. No sooner had Maximin advanced about two miles from the Danube, than he began to experience the fastidious insolence of the conqueror. He was sternly forbid to pitch his tents in a pleasant valley, lest he should infringe the distant awe that was due to the royal mansion. The ministers of Attila pressed him to communicate the business, and the instructions, which he reserved for the ear of their sovereign. When Maximin temperately urged the contrary practice of nations, he was still more confounded to find, that the resolutions of the Sacred

Consistory, those secrets (says Priscus) which should not be revealed to the gods themselves, had been treacherously disclosed to the public enemy. On his refusal to comply with such ignominious terms, the Imperial envoy was commanded instantly to depart; the order was recalled; it was again repeated; and the Huns renewed their ineffectual attempts to subdue the patient firmness of Maximin. At length, by the intercession of Scotta, the brother of Onegesius, whose friendship had been purchased by a liberal gift, he was admitted to the royal presence; but, instead of obtaining a decisive answer, he was compelled to undertake a remote journey towards the North, that Attila might enjoy the proud satisfaction of receiving, in the same camp, the ambassadors of the Eastern and Western empires. His journey was regulated by the guides, who obliged him to halt, to hasten his march, or to deviate from the common road, as it best suited the convenience of the King. The Romans who traversed the plains of Hungary, suppose that they passed several navigable rivers, either in canoes or portable boats; but there is reason to suspect, that the winding stream of the Teyss, or Tibiscus, might present itself in different places, under different names. From the contiguous villages they received a plentiful and regular supply of provisions, mead instead of wine, millet in the place of bread, and a certain liquor named *camus*, which, according to the report of Priscus, was distilled from barley.[1] Such fare might appear coarse and indelicate to men who had tasted the luxury of Constantinople: but in their accidental distress, they were relieved by the gentleness and hospitality of the same Barbarians, so terrible and so merciless in war. The ambassadors had encamped on the edge of a large morass. A violent tempest of wind and rain, of thunder and lightning, overturned their tents, immersed their baggage and furniture in the water, and scattered their retinue, who wandered in the darkness of the night, uncertain of their road, and apprehensive of some unknown danger, till they awakened by their cries the inhabitants of a neighbouring village, the property of the widow of Bleda. A bright illumination, and, in a few moments, a comfortable fire of reeds, was kindled by their officious benevolence: the wants, and even the desires, of the Romans were liberally satisfied; and they seem to have been embarrassed by the singular politeness of Bleda's widow, who added to her other favours the gift, or at least the loan, of a sufficient number of beautiful and obsequious damsels. The sunshine of the succeeding day was dedicated to repose; to collect and dry the baggage, and to the refreshment of the men and horses: but, in the evening before they pursued their journey, the ambassadors expressed their gratitude to the bounteous lady of the village, by a very acceptable present of silver cups, red fleeces, dried fruits, and Indian pepper. Soon after this adventure, they rejoined the march of Attila, from whom they had been separated about six days; and

[1] The Huns themselves still continued to despise the labours of agriculture; they abused the privilege of a victorious nation; and the Goths, their industrious subjects who cultivated the earth, dreaded their neighbourhood, like that of so many ravenous wolves (Priscus, p. 45.). In the same manner the Sarts and Tadgics provide for their own subsistence, and for that of the Usbec Tartars, their lazy and rapacious sovereigns. Genealogical History of the Tartars, p. 423. 455.

slowly proceeded to the capital of an empire, which did not contain, in the space of several thousand miles, a single city.

As far as we may ascertain the vague and obscure geography of Priscus, this capital appears to have been seated between the Danube, the Teyss, and the Carpathian hills, in the plains of Upper Hungary, and most probably in the neighbourhood of Jazberin, Agria, or Tokay.[1] In its origin it could be no more than an accidental camp, which, by the long and frequent residence of Attila, had insensibly swelled into a huge village, for the reception of his court, of the troops who followed his person, and of the various multitude of idle or industrious slaves and retainers.[2] The baths, constructed by Onegesius, were the only edifice of stone; the materials had been transported from Pannonia; and since the adjacent country was destitute even of large timber, it may be presumed, that the meaner habitations of the royal village consisted of straw, of mud, or of canvas. The wooden houses of the more illustrious Huns, were built and adorned with rude magnificence, according to the rank, the fortune, or the taste of the proprietors. They seem to have been distributed with some degree of order and symmetry; and each spot became more honourable, as it approached the person of the sovereign. The palace of Attila, which surpassed all other houses in his dominions, was built entirely of wood, and covered an ample space of ground. The outward enclosure was a lofty wall, or pallisade, of smooth square timber, intersected with high towers, but intended rather for ornament than defence. This wall, which seems to have encircled the declivity of a hill, comprehended a great variety of wooden edifices, adapted to the uses of royalty. A separate house was assigned to each of the numerous wives of Attila; and, instead of the rigid and illiberal confinement imposed by Asiatic jealousy, they politely admitted the Roman ambassadors to their presence, their table, and even to the freedom of an innocent embrace. When Maximin offered his presents to Cerca, the principal queen, he admired the singular architecture of her mansion, the height of the round columns, the size and beauty of the wood, which was curiously shaped, or turned, or polished, or carved; and his attentive eye was able to discover some taste in the ornaments, and some regularity in the proportions. After passing through the guards, who watched before the gate, the ambassadors were introduced into the private apartment of Cerca. The wife of Attila received their visit sitting, or rather lying, on a soft couch; the floor was covered with a carpet; the domestics formed a circle round the queen; and her damsels, seated on the ground, were employed in working the variegated embroidery

[1] It is evident that Priscus passed the Danube and the Teyss, and that he did not reach the foot of the Carpathian hills. Agria, Tokay, and Jazberin, are situated in the plains circumscribed by this definition. M. de Buat (Hist. des Peup. &c. vii. 461.) has chosen Tokay; Otrokosci (p. 180. apud Mascou, ix. 23.), a learned Hungarian, has preferred Jazberin, a place about 36 miles westward of Buda and the Danube.

[2] The royal village of Attila may be compared to the city of Karacorum, the residence of the successors of Zingis; which, though it appears to have been a more stable habitation, did not equal the size or splendour of the town and Abbey of St. Denys, in the 13th century (Rubruquis, in the Hist. Gen. des Voyages, vii. 286.). The camp of Aurengzebe, as it is so agreeably described by Bernier (ii. 217.), blended the manners of Scythia with the magnificence and luxury of Hindostan.

which adorned the dress of the Barbaric warriors. The Huns were ambitious of displaying those riches which were the fruit and evidence of their victories: the trappings of their horses, their swords, and even their shoes, were studded with gold and precious stones; and their tables were profusely spread with plates, and goblets, and vases of gold and silver, which had been fashioned by the labour of Grecian artists. The monarch alone assumed the superior pride of still adhering to the simplicity of his Scythian ancestors.[1] The dress of Attila, his arms, and the furniture of his horse, were plain, without ornament, and of a single colour. The royal table was served in wooden cups and platters; flesh was his only food; and the conqueror of the North never tasted the luxury of bread.

When Attila first gave audience to the Roman ambassadors on the banks of the Danube, his tent was encompassed with a formidable guard. The monarch himself was seated in a wooden chair. His stern countenance, angry gestures, and impatient tone, astonished the firmness of Maximin; but Vigilius had more reason to tremble, since he distinctly understood the menace, that if Attila did not respect the law of nations, he would nail the deceitful interpreter to a cross, and leave his body to the vultures. The Barbarian condescended, by producing an accurate list, to expose the bold falsehood of Vigilius, who had affirmed that no more than seventeen deserters could be found. But he arrogantly declared, that he apprehended only the disgrace of contending with his fugitive slaves; since he despised their impotent efforts to defend the provinces which Theodosius had entrusted to their arms: "For what fortress" (added Attila), "what city, in the "wide extent of the Roman empire, can hope to exist, secure and im-"pregnable, if it is our pleasure that it should be erased from the "earth?" He dismissed, however, the interpreter, who returned to Constantinople with his peremptory demand of more complete restitution, and a more splendid embassy. His anger gradually subsided, and his domestic satisfaction, in a marriage which he celebrated on the road with the daughter of Eslam, might perhaps contribute to mollify the native fierceness of his temper. The entrance of Attila into the royal village was marked by a very singular ceremony. A numerous troop of women came out to meet their hero, and their king. They marched before him, distributed into long and regular files: the intervals between the files were filled by white veils of thin linen, which the women on either side bore aloft in their hands, and which formed a canopy for a chorus of young virgins, who chanted hymns and songs in the Scythian language. The wife of his favourite Onegesius, with a train of female attendants, saluted Attila at the door of her own house, on his way to the palace; and offered, according to the custom of the country, her respectful homage, by intreating him to taste the wine and meat, which she had prepared for his reception. As soon as the monarch had graciously accepted her hospitable gift, his domestics lifted a small silver table to a convenient height, as he sat on horseback; and Attila, when he had touched the goblet with

[1] When the Moguls displayed the spoils of Asia, in the diet of Toncat, the throne of Zingis was still covered with the original black felt carpet on which he had been seated, when he was raised to the command of his warlike countrymen. Vie de Gengiscan, l. iv. c. 9.

his lips, again saluted the wife of Onegesius, and continued his march. During his residence at the seat of empire, his hours were not wasted in the recluse idleness of a seraglio; and the king of the Huns could maintain his superior dignity, without concealing his person from the public view. He frequently assembled his council, and gave audience to the ambassadors of the nations; and his people might appeal to the supreme tribunal, which he held at stated times, and. according to the eastern custom, before the principal gate of his wooden palace. The Romans, both of the East and of the West, were twice invited to the banquets, where Attila feasted with the princes and nobles of Scythia. Maximin and his colleagues were stopped on the threshold, till they had made a devout libation to the health and prosperity of the king of the Huns; and were conducted, after this ceremony, to their respective seats in a spacious hall. The royal table and couch, covered with carpets and fine linen, was raised by several steps in the midst of the hall; and a son, an uncle, or perhaps a favourite king, were admitted to share the simple and homely repast of Attila. Two lines of small tables, each of which contained three or four guests, were ranged in order on either hand; the right was esteemed the most honourable, but the Romans ingenuously confess, that they were placed on the left; and that Beric, an unknown chieftain, most probably of the Gothic race, preceded the representatives of Theodosius and Valentinian. The Barbarian monarch received from his cup-bearer a goblet filled with wine, and courteously drank to the health of the most distinguished guest; who rose from his seat, and expressed, in the same manner, his loyal and respectful vows. This ceremony was successively performed for all, or at least for the illustrious persons of the assembly; and a considerable time must have been consumed, since it was thrice repeated, as each course of service was placed on the table. But the wine still remained after the meat had been removed; and the Huns continued to indulge their intemperance long after the sober and decent ambassadors of the two empires had withdrawn themselves from the nocturnal banquet. Yet before they retired, they enjoyed a singular opportunity of observing the manners of the nation in their convivial amusements. Two Scythians stood before the couch of Attila, and recited the verses which they had composed, to celebrate his valour and his victories. A profound silence prevailed in the hall; and the attention of the guests was captivated by the vocal harmony, which revived and perpetuated the memory of their own exploits: a martial ardour flashed from the eyes of the warriors, who were impatient for battle; and the tears of the old men expressed their generous despair, that they could no longer partake the danger and glory of the field.[1] This entertainment, which might be considered as a school of military virtue, was succeeded by a farce, that debased the dignity of human nature. A Moorish and a Scythian buffoon successively excited the mirth of the rude spectators, by their deformed figure, ridiculous dress, antic gestures, absurd speeches, and the strange unintelligible confusion of

[1] If we may believe Plutarch (in Demetrio, v. 24.) it was the custom of the Scythians. when they indulged in the pleasures of the table, to awaken their languid courage by the martial harmony of twanging their bow-strings.

the Latin, the Gothic, and the Hunnic languages; and the hall resounded with loud and licentious peals of laughter. In the midst of this intemperate riot, Attila alone, without a change of countenance, maintained his stedfast and inflexible gravity; which was never relaxed, except on the entrance of Irnac, the youngest of his sons: he embraced the boy with a smile of paternal tenderness, gently pinched him by the cheek, and betrayed a partial affection, which was justified by the assurance of his prophets, that Irnac would be the future support of his family and empire. Two days afterwards, the ambassadors received a second invitation; and they had reason to praise the politeness, as well as the hospitality, of Attila. The king of the Huns held a long and familiar conversation with Maximin; but his civility was interrupted by rude expressions, and haughty reproaches; and he was provoked, by a motive of interest, to support, with unbecoming zeal, the private claims of his secretary Constantius. "The emperor" (said Attila) "has long promised him a rich wife: Constantius must "not be disappointed; nor should a Roman emperor deserve the "name of liar." On the third day, the ambassadors were dismissed; the freedom of several captives was granted, for a moderate ransom, to their pressing entreaties; and, besides the royal presents, they were permitted to accept from each of the Scythian nobles, the honourable and useful gift of a horse. Maximin returned, by the same road, to Constantinople; and though he was involved in an accidental dispute with Beric, the new ambassador of Attila, he flattered himself that he had contributed, by the laborious journey, to confirm the peace and alliance of the two nations.[1]

But the Roman ambassador was ignorant of the treacherous design, which had been concealed under the mask of the public faith. The surprise and satisfaction of Edecon, when he contemplated the splendour of Constantinople, had encouraged the interpreter Vigilius to procure for him a secret interview with the eunuch Chrysaphius,[2] who governed the emperor and the empire. After some previous conversation, and a mutual oath of secrecy, the eunuch, who had not, from his own feelings or experience, imbibed any exalted notions of ministerial virtue, ventured to propose the death of Attila, as an important service, by which Edecon might deserve a liberal share of the wealth and luxury which he admired. The ambassador of the Huns listened to the tempting offer; and professed, with apparent zeal, his ability, as well as readiness, to execute the bloody deed: the design was communicated to the master of the offices, and the devout Theodosius consented to the assassination of his invincible enemy. But this perfidious conspiracy was defeated by the dissimulation, or the repentance, of Edecon; and, though he might exaggerate his inward abhor-

[1] The curious narrative of this embassy, which required few observations, and was not susceptible of any collateral evidence, may be found in Priscus, p. 49. But I have not confined myself to the same order; and I had previously extracted the historical circumstances, which were less intimately connected with the journey and business of the Roman ambassadors.

[2] Tillemont has very properly given the succession of Chamberlains, who reigned in the name of Theodosius. Chrysaphius was the last, and, according to the unanimous evidence of history, the worst of these favourites (Hist. des Emp. vi. 117. Mem. Eccles. xv. 438.). His partiality for his godfather, the hierarch Eutyches, engaged him to persecute the orthodox party.

rence for the treason, which he seemed to approve, he dexterously assumed the merit of an early and voluntary confession. If we *now* review the embassy of Maximin, and the behaviour of Attila, we must applaud the Barbarian who respected the laws of hospitality, and generously entertained and dismissed the minister of a prince who had conspired against his life. But the rashness of Vigilius will appear still more extraordinary, since he returned, conscious of his guilt and danger, to the royal camp; accompanied by his son, and carrying with him a weighty purse of gold, which the favourite eunuch had furnished, to satisfy the demands of Edecon, and to corrupt the fidelity of the guards. The interpreter was instantly seized, and dragged before the tribunal of Attila, where he asserted his innocence with specious firmness, till the threat of inflicting instant death on his son, extorted from him a sincere discovery of the criminal transaction. Under the name of ransom or confiscation, the rapacious king of the Huns accepted 200 pounds of gold for the life of a traitor, whom he disdained to punish. He pointed his just indignation against a nobler object. His ambassadors Eslaw and Orestes were immediately dispatched to Constantinople, with a peremptory instruction, which it was much safer for them to execute than to disobey. They boldly entered the Imperial presence, with the fatal purse hanging down from the neck of Orestes; who interrogated the eunuch Chrysaphius, as he stood beside the throne, whether he recognized the evidence of his guilt. But the office of reproof was reserved for the superior dignity of his colleague Eslaw, who gravely addressed the Emperor of the East in the following words: "Theodosius is the son of an illustrious and respect- "able parent; Attila likewise is descended from a noble race; and *he* "has supported, by his actions, the dignity which he inherited from "his father Mundzuk. But Theodosius has forfeited his paternal "honours, and, by consenting to pay tribute, has degraded himself to "the condition of a slave. It is therefore just, that he should rever- "ence the man whom fortune and merit have placed above him; in- "stead of attempting, like a wicked slave, clandestinely to conspire "against his master." The son of Arcadius, who was accustomed only to the voice of flattery, heard with astonishment the severe language of truth; he blushed and trembled; nor did he presume directly to refuse the head of Chrysaphius, which Eslaw and Orestes were instructed to demand. A solemn embassy, armed with full powers and magnificent gifts, was hastily sent to deprecate the wrath of Attila; and his pride was gratified by the choice of Nomius and Anatolius, two ministers of consular or patrician rank, of whom the one was great treasurer, and the other was master-general of the armies of the East. He condescended to meet these ambassadors on the banks of the river Drenco; and though he at first affected a stern and haughty demeanour, his anger was insensibly mollified by their eloquence and liberality. He condescended to pardon the emperor, the eunuch, and the interpreter; bound himself by an oath to observe the conditions of peace; released a great number of captives; abandoned the fugitives and deserters to their fate; and resigned a large territory to the south of the Danube, which he had already exhausted of its wealth and inhabitants. But this treaty was purchased at an expence which might have sup-

ported a vigorous and successful war; and the subjects of Theodosius were compelled to redeem the safety of a worthless favourite by oppressive taxes, which they would more cheerfully have paid for his destruction.[1]

The emperor Theodosius did not long survive the most humiliating circumstance of an inglorious life. As he was riding, or hunting, in the neighbourhood of Constantinople, he was thrown from his horse into the river Lycus: the spine of the back was injured by the fall; and he expired some days afterwards (A.D. 450. July 28), in the 50th year of his age, and the 43rd of his reign.[2] His sister Pulcheria, whose authority had been controlled both in civil and ecclesiastial affairs by the pernicious influence of the eunuchs, was unanimously proclaimed Empress of the East; and the Romans, for the first time, submitted to a female reign. No sooner had Pulcheria ascended the throne, than she indulged her own, and the public resentment, by an act of popular justice. Without any legal trial, the eunuch Chrysaphius was executed before the gates of the city; and the immense riches which had been accumulated by the rapacious favourite, served only to hasten and to justify his punishment.[3] Amidst the general acclamations of the clergy and people, the empress did not forget the prejudice and disadvantage to which her sex was exposed; and she wisely resolved to prevent their murmurs by the choice of a colleague, who would always respect the superior rank of his wife. She gave (Aug. 25) her hand to Marcian, a senator, about 60 years of age, and the nominal husband of Pulcheria was solemnly invested with the Imperial purple. The zeal which he displayed for the orthodox creed, as it was established by the council of Chalcedon, would alone have inspired the grateful eloquence of the Catholics. But the behaviour of Marcian in a private life, and afterwards on the throne, may support a more rational belief, that he was qualified to restore and invigorate an empire, which had been almost dissolved by the successive weakness of two hereditary monarchs. He was born in Thrace, and educated to the profession of arms; but Marcian's youth had been severely exercised by poverty and misfortune, since his only resource, when he first arrived at Constantinople, consisted in 200 pieces of gold, which he had borrowed of a friend. He passed 19 years in the domestic and military service of Aspar, and his son Ardaburius; followed those powerful generals to the Persian and African wars; and obtained, by their influence, the honourable rank of tribune and senator. His mild disposition, and useful talents, without alarming the jealousy, recommended Marcian to the esteem and favour, of his patrons: he had seen, perhaps he had felt, the abuses of a venal and oppressive administration; and his own

[1] This secret conspiracy, and its important consequences, may be traced in the fragments of Priscus, p. 72. The chronology of that historian is not fixed by any precise date; but the series of negociations between Attila and the Eastern empire, must be included within the three or four years, which are terminated, A.D. 450, by the death of Theodosius.

[2] Theodorus the Reader (Vales. Hist. Eccles. iii. 563.), and the Paschal Chronicle, mention the fall, without specifying the injury: but the consequence was so likely to happen, and so unlikely to be invented, that we may safely give credit to Nicephorus Callistus, a Greek of the fourteenth century.

[3] Pulcheriæ natû (says Count Marcellinus) suâ cum avaritiâ interemptus est. She abandoned the eunuch to the pious revenge of a son, whose father had suffered at his instigation.

example gave weight and energy to the laws, which he promulgated for the reformation of manners.[1]

CHAPTER XXXV.

Invasion of Gaul by Attila.—He is repulsed by Ætius and the Visigoths.—Attila invades and evacuates Italy.—The Deaths of Attila, Ætius, and Valentinian the Third.

It was the opinion of Marcian, that war should be avoided, as long as it is possible to preserve a secure and honourable peace; but it was likewise his opinion, that peace cannot be honourable or secure, if the sovereign betrays a pusillanimous aversion to war. This temperate courage dictated his reply to the demands of Attila, who (A.D. 450) insolently pressed the payment of the annual tribute. The emperor signified to the Barbarians, that they must no longer insult the majesty of Rome, by the mention of a tribute; that he was disposed to reward, with becoming liberality, the faithful friendship of his allies; but that, if they presumed to violate the public peace, they should feel that he possessed troops, and arms, and resolution, to repel their attacks. The same language, even in the camp of the Huns, was used by his ambassador Apollonius, whose bold refusal to deliver the presents, till he had been admitted to a personal interview, displayed a sense of dignity, and a contempt of danger, which Attila was not prepared to expect from the degenerate Romans.—*Priscus*, p. 39. 72. He threatened to chastise the rash successor of Theodosius; but he hesitated, whether he should first direct his invincible arms against the Eastern or the Western empire. While mankind awaited his decision with awful suspense, he sent an equal defiance to the courts of Ravenna and Constantinople; and his ministers saluted the two emperors with the same haughty declaration. "Attila, *my* lord, and *thy* lord, commands thee to pro- "vide a palace for his immediate reception."[2] But as the Barbarian despised, or affected to despise, the Romans of the East, whom he had so often vanquished, he soon declared his resolution of suspending the easy conquest, till he had achieved a more glorious and important enterprise. In the memorable invasions of Gaul and Italy, the Huns were naturally attracted by the wealth and fertility of those provinces; but the particular motives and provocations of Attila, can only be explained by the state of the Western empire under the reign of Valentinian, or, to speak more correctly, under the administration of Ætius.[3]

[1] Procop. de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 4. Evagr. l. ii. c. 1. Theophan. p. 90, 91. Novell. ad calcem Cod. Theod. vi. 30. The praises which St. Leo, and the Catholics, have bestowed on Marcian, are diligently transcribed by Baronius, as an encouragement for future princes.

[2] The Alexandrian or Paschal Chronicle, which introduces this haughty message during the lifetime of Theodosius, may have anticipated the date; but the dull annalist was incapable of inventing the original and genuine style of Attila.

[3] Hist. Crit. de l'Etabliss. de la Mon. Françoise, i. Book ii. 189—424. throws great light on the

After the death of his rival Boniface, Ætius had prudently retired to the tents of the Huns; and he was indebted to their alliance for his safety and his restoration. Instead of the suppliant language of a guilty exile, he solicited his pardon at the head of 60,000 Barbarians; and the empress Placidia confessed, by a feeble resistance, that the condescension, which might have been ascribed to clemency, was the effect of weakness or fear. She delivered herself, her son Valentinian, and the Western empire, into the hands of an insolent subject; nor could Placidia protect the son-in-law of Boniface, the virtuous and faithful Sebastian,[1] from the implacable persecution, which urged him from one kingdom to another, till he miserably perished in the service of the Vandals. The fortunate Ætius, who was immediately promoted to the rank of patrician, and thrice invested with the honours of the consulship, assumed, with the title of master of the cavalry and infantry, the whole military power of the state; and he is sometimes styled, by contemporary writers, the Duke, or General, of the Romans of the West. His prudence, rather than his virtue, engaged him to leave the grandson of Theodosius in the possession of the purple; and Valentinian was permitted to enjoy the peace and luxury of Italy, while the patrician appeared in the glorious light of a hero and a patriot, who supported near twenty (A.D. 433—454.) years the ruins of the Western empire. The Gothic historian ingenuously confesses, that Ætius was born for the salvation of the Roman republic;[2] and the following portrait, though it is drawn in the fairest colours, must be allowed to contain a much larger proportion of truth than of flattery. "His mother was a wealthy and noble Italian, and his father Gaudentius, who held a distinguished rank in the province of Scythia, gradually rose from the station of a military *domestic*, to the dignity of master of the cavalry. Their son, who was enrolled almost in his infancy in the guards, was given as a hostage, first to Alaric, and afterwards to the Huns; and he successively obtained the civil and military honours of the palace, for which he was equally qualified by superior merit. The graceful figure of Ætius was not above the middle stature; but his manly limbs were admirably formed for strength, beauty, and agility; and he excelled in the martial exercises of managing a horse, drawing the bow, and darting the javelin. He could patiently endure the want of food or of sleep; and his mind and body were alike capable of the most laborious efforts. He possessed the genuine courage, that can despise not only dangers but injuries; and it was impossible either to corrupt, or deceive, or intimidate, the firm integrity of his soul."[3] The Barbarians, who had

state of Gaul, when it was invaded by Attila; but the ingenious author, the Abbé Dubos, too often bewilders himself in system and conjecture.

[1] Vic. Vitensis (de Persec. Vandal. l. i. c. 6. p. 8. ed. Ruinart) calls him, acer consilio et strenus in bello: but his courage, when he became unfortunate, was censured as desperate rashness; and Sebastian deserved, or obtained, the epithet of *præceps* (Sidon. Apollin. Carm. ix. 181.). His adventures at Constantinople, in Sicily, Gaul, Spain, and Africa, are faintly marked in the Chronicles of Marcellinus and Idatius. In his distress he was always followed by a numerous train; since he could ravage the Hellespont and Propontis, and seize the city of Barcelona.

[2] Reipublicæ Romanæ singulariter natus, qui superbiam Suevorum, Francorumque barbariem immensis cœdibus servire Imperio Romano coegisset. Jornandes de Reb. Get. c. 34. p. 660.

[3] This portrait is drawn by Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus, a contemporary historian,

seated themselves in the Western provinces, were insensibly taught to respect the faith and valour of the patrician Ætius. He soothed their passions, consulted their prejudices, balanced their interests, and checked their ambition. A seasonable treaty, which he concluded with Genseric, protected Italy from the depredations of the Vandals; the independent Britons implored and acknowledged his salutary aid; the Imperial authority was restored and maintained in Gaul and Spain; and he compelled the Franks and the Suevi, whom he had vanquished in the field, to become the useful confederates of the republic.

From a principle of interest, as well as gratitude, Ætius assiduously cultivated the alliance of the Huns. While he resided in their tents as a hostage, or an exile, he had familiarly conversed with Attila himself, the nephew of his benefactor; and the two famous antagonists appear to have been connected by a personal and military friendship, which they afterwards confirmed by mutual gifts, frequent embassies, and the education of Carpilio, the son of Ætius, in the camp of Attila. By the specious professions of gratitude and voluntary attachment, the patrician might disguise his apprehensions of the Scythian conqueror, who pressed the two empires with his innumerable armies. His demands were obeyed or eluded. When he claimed the spoils of a vanquished city, some vases of gold, which had been fraudulently embezzled; the civil and military governors of Noricum were immediately dispatched to satisfy his complaints:[1] and it is evident, from their conversation with Maximin and Priscus, in the royal village, that the valour and prudence of Ætius had not saved the Western Romans from the common ignominy of tribute. Yet his dexterous policy prolonged the advantages of a salutary peace; and a numerous army of Huns and Alani, whom he had attached to his person, was employed in the defence of Gaul. Two colonies of these Barbarians were judiciously fixed in the territories of Valens and Orleans:[2] and their active cavalry secured the important passages of the Rhone and of the Loire. These savage allies were not indeed less formidable to the subjects than to the enemies of Rome. Their original settlement was enforced with the licentious violence of conquest; and the province through which they marched, was exposed to all the calamities of an hostile invasion.[3] Strangers to the emperor or the republic, the Alani

known only by some extracts, which are preserved by Greg. of Tours (l. ii. c. 8. ii. 163.). It was probably the duty, or at least the interest, of Renatus, to magnify the virtues of Ætius: but he would have shown more dexterity, if he had not insisted on his patient, *forgiving* disposition.

[1] The embassy consisted of Count Romulus; of Promotus, president of Noricum; and of Romanus, the military duke. They were accompanied by Tatullus, an illustrious citizen of Petovio, in the same province, and father of Orestes, who had married the daughter of Count Romulus. Priscus, p. 57. 65. Cassiodorus (Variar. i. 4.) mentions another embassy, which was executed by his father and Carpilio, the son of Ætius; and as Attila was no more, he could safely boast of their manly intrepid behaviour in his presence.

[2] Deserta Valentinæ urbis rura Alanis partienda traduntur. Prosper. Tyronis Chron. in Historiens de France, i. 639. A few lines afterwards, Prosper observes, that lands in the *ulterior* Gaul were assigned to the Alani. Without admitting the correction of Dubos (i. 300.); the reasonable supposition of *two* colonies or garrisons of Alani, will confirm his arguments, and remove his objections.

[3] Prosper. Tyro, p. 639. Sidonius (Paneg. Avit. 246.) complains, in the name of Auvergne, his native country,

Litorius Scythicos equites tunc forte subacto
Celsus Aremorico, Geticum rapiebat in agmen
Per terras, Arverne, tuas, qui proxima quæque
Discursu, flammis, ferro, feritate, rapinis,
Delebant; pacis fallentes nomen inane.

of Gaul were devoted to the ambition of Ætius; and though he might suspect, that, in a contest with Attila himself, they would revolt to the standard of their national king, the patrician laboured to restrain, rather than to excite, their zeal and resentment against the Goths, the Burgundians, and the Franks.

The kingdom established by the Visigoths in the southern provinces of Gaul, had gradually acquired strength and maturity; and the conduct of those ambitious Barbarians, either in peace or war, engaged the perpetual vigilance of Ætius. After the death of Wallia, the Gothic sceptre devolved to Theodoric (A.D. 419—451), the son of the great Alaric;[1] and his prosperous reign, of more than thirty years, over a turbulent people, may be allowed to prove, that his prudence was supported by uncommon vigour, both of mind and body. Impatient of his narrow limits, Theodoric aspired to the possession of Arles, the wealthy seat of government and commerce; but the city was saved by the timely approach of Ætius; and the Gothic king, who had raised the siege with some loss and disgrace, was persuaded, for an adequate subsidy, to divert the martial valour of his subjects in a Spanish war. Yet Theodoric still watched, and eagerly seized, the favourable moment of renewing his hostile attempts. The Goths besieged Narbonne, while the Belgic provinces were invaded by the Burgundians; and the public safety was threatened (A.D. 435—439) on every side by the apparent union of the enemies of Rome. On every side, the activity of Ætius, and his Scythian cavalry, opposed a firm and successful resistance. Twenty thousand Burgundians were slain in battle; and the remains of the nation humbly accepted a dependent seat in the mountains of Savoy.[2] The walls of Narbonne had been shaken by the battering engines, and the inhabitants had endured the last extremities of famine, when count Litorius, approaching in silence, and directing each horseman to carry behind him two sacks of flour, cut his way through the intrenchments of the besiegers. The siege was immediately raised; and the more decisive victory, which is ascribed to the personal conduct of Ætius himself, was marked with the blood of eight thousand Goths. But in the absence of the patrician, who was hastily summoned to Italy by some public or private interest, count Litorius succeeded to the command; and his presumption soon discovered, that far different talents are required to lead a wing of cavalry, or to direct the operations of an important

Another poet, Paulinus of Perigord, confirms the complaint:

> Nam socium vix ferre queas, qui durior hoste.
>
> Dubos, i. 330.

[1] Theodoric II. the son of Theodoric I., declares to Avitus his resolution of repairing, expiating, the faults which his *grandfather* had committed.

> Quæ *noster* peccavit *avus*, quem fuscat id unum,
> Quod te, Roma, capit.———
>
> Sidon. Paneg. Avit. 505.

This character, applicable only to the great Alaric, establishes the genealogy of the Gothic kings, which has hitherto been unnoticed.

[2] The name of *Sapaudia*, the origin of *Savoy*, is first mentioned by Ammianus; and two military posts are ascertained, by the Notitia, within the limits of that province; a cohort was stationed at Grenoble in Dauphiné; and Ebredunum, or Iverdun, sheltered a fleet of small vessels, which commanded the lake of Neufchâtel. Valesius, Notit. Galliarum, p. 503. D'Anville, Not. de l'Anç. Gaule, p. 284, 579.

war. At the head of an army of Huns, he rashly advanced to the gates of Thoulouse, full of careless contempt for an enemy, whom his misfortunes had rendered prudent, and his situation made desperate. The predictions of the augurs had inspired Litorius with the profane confidence that he should enter the Gothic capital in triumph; and the trust which he reposed in his Pagan allies, encouraged him to reject the fair conditions of peace, which were repeatedly proposed by the bishops in the name of Theodoric. The king of the Goths exhibited in his distress the edifying contrast of Christian piety and moderation; nor did he lay aside his sackcloth and ashes till he was prepared to arm for the combat. His soldiers, animated with martial and religious enthusiasm, assaulted the camp of Litorius. The conflict was obstinate; the slaughter was mutual. The Roman general, after a total defeat, which could be imputed only to his unskilful rashness, was actually led through the streets of Thoulouse, not in his own, but in a hostile, triumph; and the misery which he experienced, in a long and ignominious captivity, excited the compassion of the Barbarians themselves. Such a loss in a country whose spirit and finances were long since exhausted, could not easily be repaired; and the Goths, assuming, in their turn, the sentiments of ambition and revenge, would have planted their victorious standards on the banks of the Rhone, if the presence of Ætius had not restored strength and discipline to the Romans.[1] The two armies expected the signal of a decisive action; but the generals, who were conscious of each other's force, and doubtful of their own superiority, prudently sheathed their swords in the field of battle; and their reconciliation was permanent and sincere. Theodoric, king of the Visigoths, appears to have deserved the love of his subjects, the confidence of his allies, and the esteem of mankind. His throne was surrounded by six valiant sons, who were educated with equal care in the exercises of the Barbarian camp, and in those of the Gallic schools: from the study of the Roman jurisprudence, they acquired the theory, at least, of law and justice; and the harmonious sense of Virgil contributed to soften the asperity of their native manners.[2] The two daughters of the Gothic king were given in marriage to the eldest sons of the kings of the Suevi and of the Vandals, who reigned in Spain and Africa; but these illustrious alliances were pregnant with guilt and discord. The queen of the Suevi bewailed the death of an husband, inhumanly massacred by her brother. The princess of the Vandals was the victim of a jealous

[1] ——— Capto terrarum damna patebant
Litorio, in Rhodanum proprios producere fines,
Theudoridæ fixum; nec erat pugnare necesse,
Sed migrare Getis; rabidam trux asperat iram
Victor; quòd sensit Scythicum sub mœnibus hostem
Imputat, et nihil est gravius, si forsitan unquam
Vincere contingat, trepido.——— Panegyr. Avit. 300.

Sidonius then proceeds, according to the duty of a panegyrist, to transfer the whole merit from Ætius, to his minister Avitus.

[2] Theodoric II. revered, in the person of Avitus, the character of his preceptor.

——— Mihi Romula dudum
Per te jura placent: parvumque ediscere jussit
Ad tua verba pater, docili quo prisca *Maronis*
Carmine molliret Scythicos mihi pagina mores.
Sidon. Paneg. Avit. 495, &c.

tyrant, whom she called her father. The cruel Genseric suspected, that his son's wife had conspired to poison him: the supposed crime was punished by the amputation of her nose and ears; and the unhappy daughter of Theodoric was ignominiously returned to the court of Thoulouse in that deformed and mutilated condition. This horrid act, which must seem incredible to a civilized age, drew tears from every spectator; but Theodoric was urged, by the feelings of a parent and a king, to revenge such irreparable injuries. The Imperial ministers, who always cherished the discord of the Barbarians, would have supplied the Goths with arms, and ships, and treasures for the African war; and the cruelty of Genseric might have been fatal to himself, if the artful Vandal had not armed, in his cause, the formidable power of the Huns. His rich gifts and pressing solicitations inflamed the ambition of Attila; and the designs of Ætius and Theodoric were prevented by the invasion of Gaul.[1]

The Franks, whose monarchy was still confined to the neighbourhood of the Lower Rhine, had wisely established the right of hereditary succession in the noble family of the Merovingians.[2] These princes were elevated on a buckler, the symbol of military command;[3] and the royal fashion of long hair was the ensign of their birth and dignity. Their flaxen locks, which they combed and dressed with singular care, hung down in flowing ringlets on their back and shoulders; while the rest of their nation were obliged, either by law or custom, to shave the hinder part of their head; to comb their hair over the forehead, and to content themselves with the ornament of two small whiskers.[4] The lofty stature of the Franks, and their blue eyes, denoted a Germanic origin; their close apparel accurately expressed the figure of their limbs; a weighty sword was suspended from a broad belt; their bodies were protected by a large shield: and these warlike Barbarians were trained, from their earliest youth, to run, to leap, to swim; to dart the javelin, or battle-axe, with unerring aim; to advance, without hesitation, against a superior enemy; and to maintain, either in life or death, the invincible reputation of their ancestors.[5] Clodion, the first of their long-haired kings, whose name

[1] Our authorities for the reign of Theodoric I. are, Jornan. de Reb. Get. c. 34.-36. and the Chronicles of Idatius, and the two Prospers, inserted in the Historians of France, tom. i. 612. To these we may add Salvian de Gubernatione Dei, l. vii. p. 243—245. and the Panegyric of Avitus, by Sidonius.

[2] Reges *Crinitos* se creavisse de primâ, et ut ita dicam nobiliori suorum familiâ (Greg. Turon. l. ii. c. 9. p. 166. of the second volume of the Historians of France). Gregory himself does not mention the *Merovingian* name, which may be traced, however, to the beginning of the seventh century, as the distinctive appellation of the royal family, and even of the French monarchy. An ingenious critic has deduced the Merovingians from the great Maroboduus; and he has clearly proved, that the prince, who gave his name to the first race, was more ancient than the father of Childeric. Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip., xx. 52. xxx. 557.

[3] This German custom, which may be traced from Tacitus to Gregory of Tours, was at length adopted by the emperors of Constantinople. From a MS. of the tenth century, Montfaucon has delineated the representation of a similar ceremony, which the ignorance of the age had applied to king David. Mon. de la Monar. Fran. i. Disc. Preliminaire.

[4] Cæsaries prolixa . . . . crinium flagellis per terga dimissis, &c. Preface vol. iii. Historians of France, and Le Bœuf (Dissertat. iii. 47.). This peculiar fashion of the Merovingians has been remarked by natives and strangers; by Priscus (i. 608.), by Agathias (ii. 49.), and by Gregory of Tours, l. iii. 18. vi. 24. viii. 10. ii. 196. 278. 316.

[5] See an original picture of the figure, dress, arms, and temper of the ancient Franks in Sidonius Apollinaris (Paneg. Majorian. 238.); and such pictures, though coarsely drawn, have a real and intrinsic value. Father Daniel (Hist. de la Milice Françoise, i. 2—7.) has illustrated the description.

and actions are mentioned in authentic history, held his residence at Dispargum,[1] a village, or fortress, whose place may be assigned between Louvain and Brussels. From the report of his spies, the king of the Franks was informed, that the defenceless state of the second Belgic city must yield, on the slightest attack, to the valour of his subjects. He boldly penetrated through the thickets and morasses of the Carbonarian forest;[2] occupied Tournay and Cambray, the only cities which existed in the fifth century, and extended his conquests as far as the river Somme, over a desolate country, whose cultivation and populousness are the effects of more recent industry.[3] While Clodion lay encamped in the plains of Artois,[4] and celebrated, with vain and ostentatious security, the marriage, perhaps, of his son, the nuptial feast was interrupted by the unexpected and unwelcome presence of Ætius, who had passed the Somme at the head of his light cavalry. The tables, which had been spread under the shelter of a hill, along the banks of a pleasant stream, were rudely overturned; the Franks were oppressed before they could recover their arms, or their ranks; and their unavailing valour was fatal only to themselves. The loaded waggons, which had followed their march, afforded a rich booty; and the virgin-bride, with her female attendants, submitted to the new lovers, who were imposed on them by the chance of war. This advantage, which had been obtained by the skill and activity of Ætius, might reflect some disgrace on the military prudence of Clodion; but the king of the Franks soon regained his strength and reputation, and still maintained the possession of his Gallic kingdom from the Rhine to the Somme.[5] Under his reign, and most probably from the enterprising spirit of his subjects, the three capitals, Mentz, Treves, and Cologne, experienced the effects of hostile cruelty and avarice. The distress of Cologne was prolonged by the perpetual dominion of the same Barbarians, who evacuated the ruins of Treves; and Treves, which in the space of forty years had been four times besieged and pillaged, was disposed to lose the memory of her afflictions in the vain amusements of the circus.[6] The death of Clodion, after a reign of twenty years, exposed his kingdom to the discord and ambition of his two sons. Meroveus, the younger,[7] was persuaded to

[1] Dubos, Hist. Crit. &c. i. 271. Some geographers have placed Dispargum on the German side of the Rhine. See a note of the Benedictine Editors to the Historians of France, ii. 166.

[2] The Carbonarian wood, was that part of the great forest of the Ardennes, which lay between the Escaut, or Scheld, and the Meuse. Vales. Notit. Gall. p. 126.

[3] Gregor. Turon. l. ii. c. 9. in ii. 166. Fredegar. Epitom. c. 9. p. 395. Gesta Reg. Francor. c. 5. ii. 544. Vit. St. Remig. ab Hincmar, iii. 373.

[4] ——— Francus quâ Cloio patentes Atrebatum terras pervaserat.———
Panegyr. Majorian. 212.

The precise spot was a town or village called Vicus *Helena;* and both the name and the place are discovered by modern geographers at Lens. Vales. Notit. Gall. p. 246. Longuerue, Descrip. de la France, ii. 88.

[5] See a vague account of the action in Sidonius. Paneg. Majorian. 212. The French critics, impatient to establish their monarchy in Gaul, have drawn a strong argument from the silence of Sidonius, who dares not insinuate, that the vanquished Franks were compelled to repass the Rhine. Dubos, i. 322.

[6] Salvian (de Gubern. Dei, l. vi.) has expressed, in vague and declamatory language, the misfortunes of these three cities, which are distinctly ascertained by the learned Mascou, Hist. of Anc. Germ. ix. 21.

[7] Priscus, in relating the contest, does not name the two brothers; the second of whom he had seen at Rome, a beardless youth, with long flowing hair (Historians of France, i. 607,).

implore the protection of Rome; he was received at the Imperial court, as the ally of Valentinian, and the adopted son of the patrician Ætius; and dismissed, to his native country, with splendid gifts, and the strongest assurances of friendship and support. During his absence, his elder brother had solicited, with equal ardour, the formidable aid of Attila; and the king of the Huns embraced an alliance, which facilitated the passage of the Rhine, and justified, by a specious and honourable pretence, the invasion of Gaul.[1]

When Attila declared his resolution of supporting the cause of his allies, the Vandals and the Franks, at the same time, and almost in the spirit of romantic chivalry, the savage monarch professed himself the lover and the champion of the princess Honoria. The sister of Valentinian was educated in the palace of Ravenna; and as her marriage might be productive of some danger to the state, she was raised, by the title of *Augusta*,[2] above the hopes of the most presumptuous subject. But the fair Honoria had no sooner attained the sixteenth year of her age, than she detested the importunate greatness, which must for ever exclude her from the comforts of honourable love; in the midst of vain and unsatisfactory pomp, Honoria threw herself into the arms of her chamberlain Eugenius. Her guilt and shame were soon betrayed by the appearances of pregnancy: but the disgrace of the royal family was published to the world by the imprudence of the empress Placidia; who dismissed her daughter, after a strict and shameful confinement, to a remote exile at Constantinople. The unhappy princess passed twelve or fourteen years in the irksome society of the sisters of Theodosius, whose monastic assiduity of prayer fasting, and vigils, she reluctantly imitated. Her impatience of long and hopeless celibacy, urged her to embrace a strange and desperate resolution. The name of Attila was familiar and formidable at Constantinople; and his frequent embassies entertained a perpetual intercourse between his camp and the Imperial palace. In the pursuit of love, or rather of revenge, the daughter of Placidia sacrificed every duty and every prejudice; and offered to deliver her person into the arms of a Barbarian, of whose language she was ignorant, whose figure was scarcely human, and whose religion and manners she abhorred. By the ministry of a faithful eunuch, she transmitted to Attila a ring, the pledge of her affection; and earnestly conjured him to claim her as a lawful spouse, to whom he had been secretly betrothed. These indecent advances were received, however, with coldness and disdain; and the king of the Huns continued to multiply the number of his wives, till his love was awakened by the more forcible passions of ambition and avarice. The invasion of Gaul was preceded, and justified, by a formal demand of the princess Honoria,

The Benedictine Editors are inclined to believe, that they were the sons of some unknown king of the Franks, who reigned on the banks of the Necker: but the arguments of M. de Foncemagne (Mem. de l'Acad. viii. 464.) seem to prove, that the succession of Clodion was disputed by his two sons, and that the younger was Meroveus, the father of Childeric.

[1] Under the Merovingian race, the throne was hereditary; but all the sons of the deceased monarch were equally entitled to their share of his treasures and territories. Dissert. of M. de Foncemagne, vols. vi. viii. Mem. de l'Acad.

[2] A medal is still extant, which exhibits the pleasing countenance of Honoria, with the title of Augusta; and on the reverse, the improper legend of *Salus Reipublicæ* round the monogram of Christ. Ducange, Famil. Byzantin. p. 67. 73.

with a just and equal share of the Imperial patrimony. His predecessors, the ancient Tanjous, had often addressed, in the same hostile and peremptory manner, the daughters of China; and the pretensions of Attila were not less offensive to the majesty of Rome. A firm, but temperate, refusal was communicated to his ambassadors. The right of female succession, though it might derive a specious argument from the recent examples of Placidia and Pulcheria, was strenuously denied; and the indissoluble engagements of Honoria were opposed to the claims of her Scythian lover.[1] On the discovery of her connexion with the king of the Huns, the guilty princess had been sent away, as an object of horror, from Constantinople to Italy: her life was spared; but the ceremony of her marriage was performed with some obscure and nominal husband, before she was immured in a perpetual prison, to bewail those crimes and misfortunes, which Honoria might have escaped, had she not been born the daughter of an emperor.[2]

A native of Gaul, and a contemporary, the learned and eloquent Sidonius, who was afterwards bishop of Clermont, had made a promise to one of his friends, that he would compose a regular history of the war of Attila. If the modesty of Sidonius had not discouraged him from the prosecution of this interesting work,[3] the historian would have related, with the simplicity of truth, those memorable events, to which the poet, in vague and doubtful metaphors, has concisely alluded.[4] The kings and nations of Germany and Scythia, from the Volga perhaps to the Danube, obeyed the warlike summons of Attila. From the royal village, in the plains of Hungary, his standard moved (A.D. 451) towards the West; and, after a march of seven or eight hundred miles, he reached the conflux of the Rhine and the Necker; where he was joined by the Franks, who adhered to his ally, the elder of the sons of Clodion. A troop of light Barbarians, who roamed in quest of plunder, might chuse the winter for the convenience of passing the river on the ice; but the innumerable cavalry of the Huns required such plenty of forage and provisions, as could be procured only in a milder season; the Hercynian forest supplied materials for a bridge of boats; and the hostile myriads were poured, with resistless

[1] Priscus, p. 39. It might be fairly alleged, that if females could succeed to the throne, Valentinian himself, who had married the daughter and heiress of the younger Theodosius, would have asserted her right to the Eastern empire.

[2] The adventures of Honoria are imperfectly related by Jornandes, de Successione Regn. c. 97. and de Reb. Get. c. 42. p. 674.; and in the Chronicles of Prosper and Marcellinus; but they cannot be made consistent, or probable, unless we separate, by an interval of time and place, her intrigue with Eugenius, and her invitation of Attila.

[3] Exegeras mihi, ut promitterem tibi, Attilæ bellum stylo me posteris intimaturum . . . . cœperam scribere, sed operis arepti fasce perspecto, tæduit inchoasse. Sidon. Apoll. l. viii. epist. 15. p. 246.

[4] ——— Subito cum rupta tumultu
Barbaries totas in te transfuderat Arctos,
Gallia. Pugnacem Regum comitante Gelono
Gepida trux sequitur; Scyrum Burgundio cogit:
Chunus, Bellonotus, Neurus, Basterna, *Toringus*
Bructerus, ulvosâ vel quem Nicer abluit unda
Prorumpit Francus. Cecidit cito secta bipenni
Hercynia in lintres, et Rhenum texuit alno.
Et jam terrificis diffuderat Attila turmis
In campos se Belga tuos.——— *Paneg. Avit.* 319, &c.

violence, into the Belgic provinces.[1] The consternation of Gaul was universal; and the various fortunes of its cities have been adorned by tradition with martyrdoms and miracles.[2] Troyes was saved by the merits of St. Lupus; St. Servatius was removed from the world, that he might not behold the ruin of Tongres; and the prayers of St. Genevieve diverted the march of Attila from the neighbourhood of Paris. But as the greatest part of the Gallic cities were alike destitute of saints and soldiers, they were besieged and stormed by the Huns; who practised, in the example of Metz,[3] their customary maxims of war. They involved, in a promiscuous massacre, the priests who served at the altar, and the infants, who, in the hour of danger, had been baptized by the bishop; the flourishing city was delivered to the flames, and a solitary chapel of St. Stephen marked the place where it formerly stood. From the Rhine and the Moselle, Attila advanced into the heart of Gaul; crossed the Seine at Auxerre; and, after a long and laborious march, fixed his camp under the walls of Orleans. He was desirous of securing his conquests by the possession of an advantageous post, which commanded the passage of the Loire; and he depended on the secret invitation of Sangiban, king of the Alani, who had promised to betray the city, and to revolt from the service of the empire. But this treacherous conspiracy was detected and disappointed: Orleans had been strengthened with recent fortifications; and the assaults of the Huns were vigorously repelled by the faithful valour of the soldiers, or citizens, who defended the place. The pastoral diligence of Anianus, a bishop of primitive sanctity and consummate prudence, exhausted every art of religious policy to support their courage, till the arrival of the expected succours. After an obstinate siege, the walls were shaken by the battering-rams; the Huns had already occupied the suburbs; and the people who were incapable of bearing arms, lay prostrate in prayer. Anianus, who anxiously counted the days and hours, dispatched a trusty messenger to observe, from the rampart, the face of the distant country. He returned twice, without any intelligence, that could inspire hope or comfort; but, in his third report, he mentioned a small cloud, which he had faintly descried at the extremity of the horizon. "It is the aid of "God," exclaimed the bishop in a tone of pious confidence; and the whole multitude repeated after him, "It is the aid of God." The re-

[1] The most authentic and circumstantial account of this war is contained in Jornan. (de Reb. Get. c. 36—41. p. 662.), who has sometimes abridged, and sometimes transcribed, the larger history of Cassiodorus. Jornandes, a quotation which it would be superfluous to repeat, may be corrected and illustrated by Greg. of Tours, l. 2. c. 5, 6, 7. and Chron. of Idatius, Isidore, and the two Prospers. All the ancient testimonies are collected and inserted in the Historians of France; but the reader should be cautioned against a supposed extract from the Chronicle of Idatius (among the fragments of Fredegarius, ii. 462.), which often contradicts the genuine text of the Gallician bishop.

[2] The *ancient* legendaries deserve some regard, as they are obliged to connect their fables with the real history of their own times. The Lives of St. Lupus, St. Anianus, the bishops of Metz, Ste. Genevieve, &c. in the Historians of France, i. 644. iii. p. 369.

[3] The scepticism of De Buat (Hist. des Peup. vii. 539.) cannot be reconciled with any principles of reason or criticism. Is not Gregory of Tours precise and positive in his account of the destruction of Metz? At the distance of no more than an hundred years, could he be ignorant, could the people be ignorant, of the fate of a city, the actual residence of his sovereigns, the kings of Austrasia? He seems to have undertaken the apology of Attila and the Barbarians, appeals to the false Idatius, *parcens* civitatibus Germaniæ et Galliæ, and forgets, that the true Idatius had explicitly affirmed, plurimæ civitates *effractæ*, among which he enumerates Metz.

mote object, on which every eye was fixed, became each moment larger, and more distinct; the Roman and Gothic banners were gradually perceived; and a favourable wind blowing aside the dust, discovered, in deep array, the impatient squadrons of Ætius and Theodoric, who pressed forwards to the relief of Orleans.

The facility with which Attila had penetrated into the heart of Gaul, may be ascribed to his insidious policy, as well as to the terror of his arms. His public declarations were skilfully mitigated by his private assurances; he alternately soothed and threatened the Romans and the Goths; and the courts of Ravenna and Thoulouse, mutually suspicious of each other's intentions, beheld, with supine indifference, the approach of their common enemy. Ætius was the sole guardian of the public safety; but his wisest measures were embarrassed by a faction, which, since the death of Placidia, infested the Imperial palace: the youth of Italy trembled at the sound of the trumpet; and the Barbarians, who, from fear or affection, were inclined to the cause of Attila, awaited, with doubtful and venal faith, the event of the war. The patrician passed the Alps at the head of some troops, whose strength and numbers scarcely deserved the name of an army.[1] But on his arrival at Arles, or Lyons, he was confounded by the intelligence, that the Visigoths, refusing to embrace the defence of Gaul, had determined to expect, within their own territories, the formidable invader, whom they professed to despise. The senator Avitus, who, after the honourable exercise of the Prætorian præfecture, had retired to his estate in Auvergne, was persuaded to accept the important embassy, which he executed with ability and success. He represented to Theodoric, that an ambitious conqueror, who aspired to the dominion of the earth, could be resisted only by the firm and unanimous alliance of the powers whom he laboured to oppress. The lively eloquence of Avitus inflamed the Gothic warriors, by the description of the injuries which their ancestors had suffered from the Huns; whose implacable fury still pursued them from the Danube to the foot of the Pyrenees. He strenuously urged, that it was the duty of every Christian to save, from sacrilegious violation, the churches of God, and the relics of the saints: that it was the interest of every Barbarian, who had acquired a settlement in Gaul, to defend the fields and vineyards, which were cultivated for his use, against the desolaion of the Scythian shepherds. Theodoric yielded to the evidence of truth; adopted the measure at once the most prudent and the most honourable; and declared, that as the faithful ally of Ætius and the Romans, he was ready to expose his life and his kingdom for the common safety of Gaul.[2] The Visigoths, who, at that time, were in the mature vigour of their fame and power, obeyed with alacrity the signal

[1] ———— Vix liquerat Alpes
Aetius, tenue, et rarum sine milite ducens
Robur, in auxiliis Geticum male credulus agmen
Incassum propriis præsumens adfore castris.
Panegyr. Avit. 328.

[2] The policy of Attila, of Ætius, and of the Visigoths, is imperfectly described in the Panegyric of Avitus, and the thirty-sixth chapter of Jornandes. The poet and the historian were both biassed by personal or national prejudices. The former exalts the merit and importance of Avitus; orbis, Avite, salus, &c.! The latter is anxious to show the Goths in the most favourable light. Yet their agreement, when they are fairly interpreted, is a proof of their veracity.

of war; prepared their arms and horses, and assembled under the standard of their aged king, who was resolved, with his two eldest sons, Torismond and Theodoric, to command in person his numerous and valiant people. The example of the Goths determined several tribes or nations, that seemed to fluctuate between the Huns and the Romans. The indefatigable diligence of the patrician gradually collected the troops of Gaul and Germany, who had formerly acknowledged themselves the subjects, or soldiers, of the republic, but who now claimed the rewards of voluntary service, and the rank of independent allies; the Læti, the Armoricans, the Breones, the Saxons, the Burgundians, the Sarmatians, or Alani, the Ripuarians, and the Franks who followed Meroveus as their lawful prince. Such was the various army, which, under the conduct of Ætius and Theodoric, advanced, by rapid marches, to relieve Orleans, and to give battle to the innumerable host of Attila.[1]

On their approach, the king of the Huns immediately raised the siege, and sounded a retreat to recall the foremost of his troops from the pillage of a city which they had already entered.[2] The valour of Attila was always guided by his prudence; and as he foresaw the fatal consequences of a defeat in the heart of Gaul, he repassed the Seine, and expected the enemy in the plains of Châlons, whose smooth and level surface was adapted to the operations of his Scythian cavalry. But in this tumultuary retreat, the vanguard of the Romans, and their allies, continually pressed, and sometimes engaged, the troops whom Attila had posted in the rear; the hostile columns, in the darkness of the night, and the perplexity of the roads, might encounter each other without design; and the bloody conflict of the Franks and Gepidæ, in which 15,000[3] Barbarians were slain, was a prelude to a more general and decisive action. The Catalaunian fields[4] spread themselves round Châlons, and extend, according to the vague measurement of Jornandes, to the length of 150, and the breadth of 100, miles, over the whole province, which is intitled to the appellation of a *champaign* country.[5] This spacious plain was distinguished, however, by some inequalities of ground; and the importance of an height, which commanded the camp of Attila, was understood, and disputed, by the two generals. The young and valiant Torismond first occupied the summit; the Goths rushed with irresistible weight

[1] The review of the army of Ætius is made by Jornan. c. 36. p. 664. ed. Grot. ii. 23. of the Historians of France, with the notes of the Benedictine Editor. The *Læti* were a promiscuous race of Barbarians, born or naturalized in Gaul; and the Riparii, or *Ripuarii*, derived their name from their posts on the three rivers, the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Moselle; the *Armoricans* possessed the independent cities between the Seine and the Loire. A colony of *Saxons* had been planted in the diocese of Bayeux; the *Burgundians* were settled in Savoy; and the *Breones* were a warlike tribe of Rhætians, to the east of the lake of Constance.

[2] Aurelianensis urbis obsidio, oppugnatio, irruptio, nec direptio, l. v. Sidon. Apollin. l. viii. epist. 15. p. 246.

[3] The common editions read XCM; but there is some authority of manuscripts (and almost any authority is sufficient) for the more reasonable number of XVM.

[4] Châlons, or Duro-Catalaunum, afterwards *Catalauni*, had formerly made a part of the territory of Rheims, from whence it is distant only 27 miles. Vales. Notit. Gall. p. 136. D'Anville, Not. de l'Anc. Gaule. p. 212. 279.

[5] The name of Campania, or Campagne, is frequently mentioned by Gregory of Tours; and that great province, of which Rheims was the capital, obeyed the command of a duke. Vales. Notit. p. 120.

on the Huns, who laboured to ascend from the opposite side; and the possession of this advantageous post inspired both the troops and their leaders with a fair assurance of victory. The anxiety of Attila prompted him to consult his priests and haruspices. It was reported, that, after scrutinizing the entrails of victims, and scraping their bones, they revealed, in mysterious language, his own defeat, with the death of his principal adversary; and that the Barbarian, by accepting the equivalent, expressed his involuntary esteem for the superior merit of Ætius. But the unusual despondency, which seemed to prevail among the Huns, engaged Attila to use the expedient, so familiar to the generals of antiquity, of animating his troops by a military oration; and his language was that of a king, who had often fought and conquered at their head.[1] He pressed them to consider their past glory, their actual danger, and their future hopes. The same fortune, which opened the deserts and morasses of Scythia to their unarmed valour, which had laid so many warlike nations prostrate at their feet, had reserved the *joys* of this memorable field for the consummation of their victories. The cautious steps of their enemies, their strict alliance, and their advantageous posts, he artfully represented as the effects, not of prudence, but of fear. The Visigoths alone were the strength and nerves of the opposite army; and the Huns might securely trample on the degenerate Romans, whose close and compact order betrayed their apprehensions, and who were equally incapable of supporting the dangers, or the fatigues, of a day of battle. The doctrine of predestination, so favourable to martial virtue, was carefully inculcated by the king of the Huns; who assured his subjects, that the warriors, protected by Heaven, were safe and invulnerable amidst the darts of the enemy; but that the unerring Fates would strike their victims in the bosom of inglorious peace. "I my-"self," continued Attila, "will throw the first javelin, and the wretch "who refuses to imitate the example of his sovereign is devoted to in-"evitable death." The spirit of the Barbarians was rekindled by the presence, the voice, and the example of their intrepid leader; and Attila, yielding to their impatience, immediately formed his order of battle. At the head of his brave and faithful Huns, he occupied, in person, the centre of the line. The nations subject to his empire, the Rugians, the Heruli, the Thuringians, the Franks, the Burgundians, were extended, on either hand, over the ample space of the Catalaunian fields; the right wing was commanded by Ardaric, king of the Gepidæ; and the three valiant brothers, who reigned over the Ostrogoths, were posted on the left to oppose the kindred tribes of the Visigoths. The disposition of the allies was regulated by a different principle. Sangiban, the faithless king of the Alani, was placed in the centre; where his motions might be strictly watched, and his treachery might be instantly punished. Ætius assumed the command of the left, and Theodoric of the right, wing; while Torismond still continued to occupy the heights which appear to have stretched on the

[1] I am sensible that these military orations are usually composed by the historian; yet the old Ostrogoths, who had served under Attila, might repeat his discourse to Cassiodorus: the ideas, and even the expressions, have an original Scythian cast; and I doubt whether an Italian of the sixth century would have thought of the hujus certaminis *gaudia*.

flank, and perhaps the rear, of the Scythian army. The nations from the Volga to the Atlantic were assembled on the plain of Châlons; but many of these nations had been divided by faction, or conquest, or emigration; and the appearance of similar arms and ensigns, which threatened each other, presented the image of a civil war.

The discipline and tactics of the Greeks and Romans form an interesting part of their national manners. The attentive study of the military operations of Xenophon, or Cæsar, or Frederic, when they are described by the same genius which conceived and executed them, may tend to improve (if such improvement can be wished) the art of destroying the human species. But the battle of Châlons can only excite our curiosity, by the magnitude of the object; since it was decided by the blind impetuosity of Barbarians, and has been related by partial writers, whose civil or ecclesiastical profession secluded them from the knowledge of military affairs. Cassiodorus, however, had familiarly conversed with many Gothic warriors who served in that memorable engagement; "a conflict," as they informed him, "fierce, "various, obstinate, and bloody; such as could not be paralleled, either in the present, or in past ages." The number of the slain amounted to 162,000, or, according to another account, 300,000 persons;[1] and their incredible exaggerations suppose a real and effective loss, sufficient to justify the historian's remark, that whole generations may be swept away, by the madness of kings, in the space of a single hour. After the mutual and repeated discharge of missile weapons, in which the archers of Scythia might signalize their superior dexterity, the cavalry and infantry of the two armies were furiously mingled in closer combat. The Huns, who fought under the eyes of their king, pierced through the feeble and doubtful centre of the allies, separated their wings from each other, and wheeling, with a rapid effort, to the left, directed their whole force against the Visigoths. As Theodoric rode along the ranks, to animate his troops, he received a mortal stroke from the javelin of Andages, a noble Ostrogoth, and immediately fell from his horse. The wounded king was oppressed in the general disorder, and trampled under the feet of his own cavalry; and this important death served to explain the ambiguous prophecy of the haruspices. Attila already exulted in the confidence of victory, when the valiant Torismond descended from the hills, and verified the remainder of the prediction. The Visigoths, who had been thrown into confusion by the flight, or defection, of the Alani, gradually restored their order of battle; and the Huns were undoubtedly vanquished, since Attila was compelled to retreat. He had exposed his person with the rashness of a private soldier; but the intrepid troops of the centre had pushed forwards beyond the rest of the line; their attack was faintly supported; their flanks were unguarded; and the conquerors of Scythia and Germany were saved by the approach of the night from a total defeat. They retired within the circle of waggons that fortified their camp; and the

[1] The expressions of Jornandes, or rather of Cassiodorus, are extremely strong. Bellum atrox, multiplex, immane, pertinax, cui simili nulla usquam narrat antiquitas: ubi talia gesta referuntur, ut nihil esset quod in vitâ suâ conspicere potuisset egregius, qui hujus miraculi privaretur aspectû. Dubos (Hist. Crit. i. 392.), attempts to reconcile the 162,000 of Jornandes, with the 300,000 of Idatius and Isidore; by supposing, that the larger number included the total destruction of the war, the effects of disease, the slaughter of the unarmed people, &c.

dismounted squadrons prepared themselves for a defence, to which neither their arms, nor their temper, were adapted. The event was doubtful: but Attila had secured a last and honourable resource. The saddles and rich furniture of the cavalry were collected, by his order, into a funeral pile; and the magnanimous Barbarian had resolved, if his intrenchments should be forced, to rush headlong into the flames, and to deprive his enemies of the glory which they might have acquired, by the death or captivity of Attila.[1]

But his enemies had passed the night in equal disorder and anxiety. The inconsiderate courage of Torismond was tempted to urge the pursuit, till he unexpectedly found himself, with a few followers, in the midst of the Scythian waggons. In the confusion of a nocturnal combat, he was thrown from his horse; and the Gothic prince must have perished like his father, if his youthful strength, and the intrepid zeal of his companions, had not rescued him from this dangerous situation. In the same manner, but on the left of the line, Ætius himself, separated from his allies, ignorant of their victory, and anxious for their fate, encountered and escaped the hostile troops, that were scattered over the plains of Châlons; and at length reached the camp of the Goths, which he could only fortify with a slight rampart of shields, till the dawn of day. The Imperial general was soon satisfied of the defeat of Attila, who still remained inactive within his intrenchments; and when he contemplated the bloody scene, he observed, with secret satisfaction, that the loss had principally fallen on the Barbarians. The body of Theodoric, pierced with honourable wounds, was discovered under a heap of the slain: his subjects bewailed the death of their king and father; but their tears were mingled with songs and acclamations, and his funeral rites were performed in the face of a vanquished enemy. The Goths, clashing their arms, elevated on a buckler his eldest son Torismond, to whom they justly ascribed the glory of their success; and the new king accepted the obligation of revenge, as a sacred portion of his paternal inheritance. Yet the Goths themselves were astonished by the fierce and undaunted aspect of their formidable antagonist; and their historian has compared Attila to a lion encompassed in his den, and threatening his hunters with redoubled fury. The kings and nations, who might have deserted his standard in the hour of distress, were made sensible, that the displeasure of their monarch was the most imminent and inevitable danger. All his instruments of martial music incessantly sounded a loud and animating strain of defiance; and the foremost troops who advanced to the assault, were checked, or destroyed, by showers of arrows from every side of the intrenchments. It was determined in a general council of war, to besiege the king of the Huns in his camp, to intercept his provisions, and to reduce him to the alternative of a disgraceful treaty, or an unequal combat. But the impatience of the Barbarians soon disdained these cautious and dilatory measures: and the mature policy of Ætius was apprehensive,

[1] De Buat (Hist. des Peup. &c. vii. 554.), still depending on the *false*, and again rejecting the *true*, Idatius, has divided the defeat of Attila into two great battles; the former near Orleans, the latter in Champagne: in the one, Theodoric was slain; in the other, he was revenged.

that, after the extirpation of the Huns, the republic would be oppressed by the pride and power of the Gothic nation. The patrician exerted the superior ascendant of authority and reason, to calm the passions, which the son of Theodoric considered as a duty; represented, with seeming affection, and real truth, the dangers of absence and delay; and persuaded Torismond to disappoint, by his speedy return, the ambitious designs of his brothers, who might occupy the throne and treasures of Thoulouse.[1] After the departure of the Goths, and the separation of the allied army, Attila was surprised at the vast silence that reigned over the plains of Châlons: the suspicion of some hostile stratagem detained him several days within the circle of his waggons; and his retreat beyond the Rhine confessed the last victory which was achieved in the name of the Western empire. Meroveus and his Franks, observing a prudent distance, and magnifying the opinion of their strength, by the numerous fires which they kindled every night, continued to follow the rear of the Huns, till they reached the confines of Thuringia. The Thuringians served in the army of Attila: they traversed, both in their march and in their return, the territories of the Franks; and it was perhaps in this war that they exercised the cruelties, which, about fourscore years afterwards, were revenged by the son of Clovis. They massacred their hostages, as well as their captives: two hundred young maidens were tortured with exquisite and unrelenting rage; their bodies were torn asunder by wild horses, or their bones were crushed under the weight of rolling waggons; and their unburied limbs were abandoned on the public roads, as a prey to dogs and vultures. Such were those savage ancestors, whose imaginary virtues have sometimes excited the praise and envy of civilized ages![2]

Neither the spirit, nor the forces, nor the reputation of Attila, were impaired by the failure of the Gallic expedition. In the ensuing spring, he repeated his demand of the princess Honoria, and her patrimonial treasures. The demand was again rejected, or eluded; and the indignant lover immediately took the field (A. D. 452), passed the Alps, invaded Italy, and besieged Aquileia with an innumerable host of Barbarians. Those Barbarians were unskilled in the methods of conducting a regular siege, which, even among the ancients, required some knowledge, or at least some practice, of the mechanic arts. But the labour of many thousand provincials and captives, whose lives were sacrificed without pity, might execute the most painful and dangerous work. The skill of the Roman artists might be corrupted to the destruction of their country. The walls of Aquileia were assaulted by a formidable train of battering-rams, movable tur-

[1] Jornan. de Reb. Get. c. 41. p. 671. The policy of Ætius, and the behaviour of Torismond, are extremely natural; and the patrician, according to Greg. of Tours (l. ii. c. 7. p. 163.) dismissed the prince of the Franks, by suggesting to him a similar apprehension. The false Idatius ridiculously pretends, that Ætius paid a clandestine, nocturnal, visit to the kings of the Huns and of the Visigoths; from each of whom he obtained a bribe of 10,000 pieces of gold, as the price of an undisturbed retreat.

[2] These cruelties, which are passionately deplored by Theodoric, the son of Clovis (Greg. of Tours, l. iii. c. 10. p. 190.), suit the time and circumstances of the invasion of Attila. His residence in Thuringia was long attested by popular tradition; and he is supposed to have assembled a *couroultai*, or diet, in the territory of Eisenach. Mascou, ix. 30. who settles with nice accuracy the extent of ancient Thuringia, and derives its name from the Gothic tribe of the Thervingi.

rets, and engines, that threw stones, darts, and fire;[1] and the monarch of the Huns employed the forcible impulse of hope, fear, emulation, and interest, to subvert the only barrier which delayed the conquest of Italy. Aquileia was at that period one of the richest, the most populous, and the strongest of the maritime cities of the Adriatic coast. The Gothic auxiliaries, who appear to have served under their native princes Alaric and Antala, communicated their intrepid spirit; and the citizens still remembered the glorious and successful resistance, which their ancestors had opposed to a fierce, inexorable Barbarian, who disgraced the majesty of the Roman purple. Three months were consumed without effect in the siege of Aquileia; till the want of provisions, and the clamours of his army, compelled Attila to relinquish the enterprise; and reluctantly to issue his orders, that the troops should strike their tents the next morning, and begin their retreat. But as he rode round the walls, pensive, angry, and disappointed, he observed a stork preparing to leave her nest, in one of the towers, and to fly with her infant family towards the country. He seized, with the ready penetration of a statesman, this trifling incident, which chance had offered to superstition; and exclaimed, in a loud and cheerful tone, that such a domestic bird, so constantly attached to human society, would never have abandoned her ancient seats, unless those towers had been devoted to impending ruin and solitude.[2] The favourable omen inspired an assurance of victory; the siege was renewed, and prosecuted with fresh vigour; a large breach was made in the part of the wall from whence the stork had taken her flight; the Huns mounted to the assault with irresistible fury; and the succeeding generation could scarcely discover the ruins of Aquileia.[3] After this dreadful chastisement, Attila pursued his march; and as he passed, the cities of Altinum, Concordia, and Padua, were reduced into heaps of stones and ashes. The inland towns, Vicenza, Verona, and Bergamo, were exposed to the rapacious cruelty of the Huns. Milan and Pavia submitted, without resistance, to the loss of their wealth, and applauded the unusual clemency, which preserved from the flames the public, as well as private, buildings; and spared the lives of the captive multitude. The popular traditions of Comum, Turin, or Modena, may justly be suspected; yet they concur with more authentic evidence to prove, that Attila spread his ravages over the rich plains of modern Lombardy; which are divided by the Po, and bounded by the Alps and Apennine.[4] When he took possession of

[1] Machinis constructis, omnibusque tormentorum generibus adhibitis. Jornan. c. 42. p. 673. In the thirteenth century, the Moguls battered the cities of China with large engines, constructed by the Mahometans or Christians in their service, which threw stones from 150 to 300 pounds weight. In the defence of their country, the Chinese used gunpowder, and even bombs, above an hundred years before they were known in Europe; yet even those celestial, or infernal, arms were insufficient to protect a pusillanimous nation. Gaubil. Hist. des Mongous, p. 70. 155, &c.

[2] The same story is told by Jornandes, and by Procop. (de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 4. p. 187.): nor is it easy to decide, which is the original. But the Greek historian is guilty of an inexcusable mistake, in placing the siege of Aquileia *after* the death of Ætius.

[3] Jornandes, about 100 years afterwards, affirms, that Aquileia was so completely ruined, ita ut vix ejus vestigia, ut appareant, reliquerint. Jornan. de Reb. Get. c. 42. p. 673. Paul. Diacon. l. ii. c. 14. p. 785. Liutprand. Hist. l. iii. c. 2. The name of Aquileia was sometimes applied to Forum Julii (Cividad dell Friuli), the more recent capital of the Venetian province.

[4] In describing the war of Attila, a war so famous, but so imperfectly known, I have taken

the royal palace of Milan, he was surprised, and offended, at the sight of a picture, which represented the Cæsars seated on their throne, and the princes of Scythia prostrate at their feet. The revenge which Attila inflicted on this monument of Roman vanity, was harmless and ingenious. He commanded a painter to reverse the figures, and the attitudes; and the emperors were delineated on the same canvas, approaching in a suppliant posture to empty their bags of tributary gold before the throne of the Scythian monarch.[1] The spectators must have confessed the truth and propriety of the alteration; and were perhaps tempted to apply, on this singular occasion, the well-known fable of the dispute between the lion and the man.[2]

It is a saying worthy of the ferocious pride of Attila, that the grass never grew on the spot where his horse had trod. Yet the savage destroyer undesignedly laid the foundations of a republic, which revived in the feudal state of Europe, the art and spirit of commercial industry. The celebrated name of Venice, or Venetia,[3] was formerly diffused over a large and fertile province of Italy, from the confines of Pannonia to the river Adda, and from the Po to the Rhætian and Julian Alps. Before the irruption of the Barbarians, fifty Venetian cities flourished in peace and prosperity: Aquileia was placed in the most conspicuous station: but the ancient dignity of Padua was supported by agriculture and manufactures; and the property of five hundred citizens, who were entitled to the equestrian rank, must have amounted, at the strictest computation, to one million seven hundred thousand pounds. Many families of Aquileia, Padua, and the adjacent towns, who fled from the sword of the Huns, found a safe, though obscure, refuge in the neighbouring islands.[4] At the extremity of the Gulf, where the Hadriatic feebly imitates the tides of the ocean, near an hundred small islands are separated by shallow water from the continent, and protected from the waves by several long slips of land, which admit the entrance of vessels through some secret and narrow channels.[5] Till the middle of the fifth century, these remote and sequestered spots remained without cultivation, with few inhabitants, and almost without a name. But the manners of the Venetian fugitives, their arts and their government,

for my guides two learned Italians, who considered the subject with some peculiar advantages; Sigonius, de Imperio Occidentali, l. xiii. in his works, i. 495.; and Muratori, Annali d'Italia, iv. p. 229.

[1] This article may be found under two different articles (μεδιολανου and κορυκος) of the miscellaneous compilation of Suidas.

[2] Leo respondit, humanâ hoc pictum manû:
Videres hominem dejectum, si pingere
Leones scirent.
Appendix ad Phædrum, Fab. xxv.

The lion in Phædrus every foolishly appeals from pictures to the amphitheatre: and I am glad to observe, that the native taste of La Fontaine (l. iii. fable x.) has omitted this most lame and impotent conclusion.

[3] Paul the Deacon (de Gestis Langobard. l. ii. c. 14. p. 784.) describes the provinces of Italy about the end of the eighth century. *Venetia* non solum in paucis insulis quas nunc Venetias dicimus, constat; sed ejus terminis a Pannoniæ finibus usque Adduam fluvium protelatur. The history of that province till the age of Charlemagne forms the first and most interesting part of the Verona Illustrata (p. 1—388.), in which the marquis Scipio Maffei has shown himself equally capable of enlarged views and minute disquisitions.

[4] This emigration is not attested by any contemporary evidence; but the fact is proved by the event, and the circumstances might be preserved by tradition. The citizens of Aquileia retired to the Isle of Gradus, those of Padua to Rivus Altus, or Rialto, where the city of Venice was afterwards built, &c.

[5] The topography and antiquities of the Venetian islands, from Gradus to Clodia, or Chioggia, are accurately stated in the Dissert. Chorog. de Italiâ Medii Ævi, p. 151—155.

were gradually formed by their new situation; and one of the epistles of Cassiodorus,[1] which describes their condition about seventy years afterwards, may be considered as the primitive monument of the republic. The minister of Theodoric compares them, in his quaint declamatory style, to water-fowl, who had fixed their nests on the bosom of the waves; and though he allows, that the Venetian provinces had formerly contained many noble families, he insinuates, that they were now reduced by misfortune to the same level of humble poverty. Fish was the common, and almost the universal, food of every rank: their only treasure consisted in the plenty of salt, which they extracted from the sea: and the exchange of that commodity, so essential to human life, was substituted in the neighbouring markets to the currency of gold and silver. A people whose habitations might be doubtfully assigned to the earth or water, soon became alike familiar with the two elements; and the demands of avarice succeeded to those of necessity. The islanders, who, from Grado to Chiozza, were intimately connected with each other, penetrated into the heart of Italy, by the secure, though laborious, navigation of the rivers and inland canals. Their vessels, which were continually increasing in size and number, visited all the harbours of the Gulf; and the marriage, which Venice annually celebrates with the Hadriatic, was contracted in her early infancy. The epistle of Cassiodorus, the Prætorian præfect, is addressed to the maritime tribunes: and he exhorts them, in a mild tone of authority, to animate the zeal of their countrymen for the public service, which required their assistance to transport the magazines of wine and oil from the province of Istria to the Royal city of Ravenna. The ambiguous office of these magistrates is explained by the tradition, that, in the twelve principal islands, twelve tribunes, or judges, were created by an annual and popular election. The existence of the Venetian republic under the Gothic kingdom of Italy, is attested by the same authentic record, which annihilates their lofty claim of original and perpetual independence.[2]

The Italians, who had long since renounced the exercise of arms, were surprised, after forty years' peace, by the approach of a formidable Barbarian, whom they abhorred, as the enemy of their religion, as well as of their republic. Amidst the general consternation, Ætius alone was incapable of fear; but it was impossible that he should achieve, alone, and unassisted, any military exploits worthy of his former renown. The Barbarians who had defended Gaul, refused to march to the relief of Italy; and the succours promised by the Eastern emperor were distant and doubtful. Since Ætius, at the head of his domestic troops, still maintained the field, and harassed or retarded the march of Attila, he never showed himself more truly great, than at the time

[1] Cassiodor. Variar. l. xii. epist. 24. Maffei (Verona Illustrata, part i. 240.) has translated and explained this curious letter, in the spirit of a learned antiquarian and a faithful subject, who considered Venice as the only legitimate offspring of the Roman republic. He fixes the date of the epistle, and consequently the præfecture, of Cassiodorus, A.D. 523.; and the marquis's authority has the more weight, as he had prepared an edition of his works, and actually published a Dissertation on the true orthography of his name. Osservaz. Letter. ii. 290.

[2] Amelot de la Houssaie Hist. du Gouv. de Venise, vol. ii., a translation of the famous *Squittinio*. This book, which has been exalted far above its merits, is stained, in every line, with the disingenuous malevolence of party: but the principal evidence, genuine and apocryphal, is brought together, and the reader will easily chuse the fair medium.

when his conduct was blamed by an ignorant and ungrateful people.[1] If the mind of Valentinian had been susceptible of any generous sentiments, he would have chosen such a general for his example and his guide. But the timid grandson of Theodosius, instead of sharing the dangers, escaped from the sound of war; and his hasty retreat from Ravenna to Rome, from an impregnable fortress to an open capital, betrayed his secret intention of abandoning Italy, as soon as the danger should approach his Imperial person. This shameful abdication was suspended, however, by the spirit of doubt and delay, which commonly adheres to pusillanimous counsels, and sometimes corrects their pernicious tendency. The Western emperor, with the senate and people of Rome, embraced the more salutary resolution of deprecating, by a solemn and suppliant embassy, the wrath of Attila. This important commission was accepted by Avienus, who, from his birth and riches, his consular dignity, the numerous train of his clients, and his personal abilities, held the first rank in the Roman senate. The specious and artful character of Avienus,[2] was admirably qualified to conduct a negociation either of public or private interest: his colleague Trigetius had exercised the Prætorian præfecture of Italy; and Leo, bishop of Rome, consented to expose his life for the safety of his flock. The genius of Leo[3] was exercised and displayed in the public misfortunes; and he has deserved the appellation of *Great*, by the successful zeal, with which he laboured to establish his opinions, and his authority, under the venerable names of orthodox faith, and ecclesiastical discipline. The Roman ambassadors were introduced to the tent of Attila, as he lay encamped at the place where the slow-winding Mincius is lost in the foaming waves of the lake Benacus,[4] and trampled with his Scythian cavalry the farms of Catullus and Virgil.[5] The Barbarian monarch listened with favourable, and even respectful, attention; and the deliverance of Italy was purchased by the immense ransom, or dowry, of the princess Honoria. The state of his army might facilitate the treaty, and hasten his retreat. Their martial spirit was relaxed by the wealth and indolence of a warm climate. The

[1] Sirmond (Not. ad Sidon. Apollin. p. 19.) has published a curious passage from the Chronicle of Prosper. Attila redintegratis viribus, quas in Gallia amiserat, Italiam ingredi per Pannonias intendit; nihil duce nostro Ætio secundum prioris belli opera prospiciente, &c. He reproaches Ætius with neglecting to guard the Alps, and with a design to abandon Italy: but this rash censure may at least be counterbalanced by the favourable testimonies of Idatius and Isidore.

[2] See the original portraits of Avienus, and his rival Basilius, delineated and contrasted in the epistles (i. 9. p. 22.) of Sidonius. He had studied the characters of the two chiefs of the senate; but he attached himself to Basilius, as the more solid and disinterested friend.

[3] The character and principles of Leo may be traced in 141 original epistles, which illustrate the ecclesiastical history of his long and busy pontificate, from A.D. 440 to 461. Dupin, Bibliot. Eccles. iii. part ii. 120.

[4] ——— tardis ingens ubi flexibus errat
Mincius, et tenerâ prætexit arundine ripas.
* * * * * * *
Anne lacus tantos, et Lari maxime, teque
Fluctibus, et fremitu assurgens *Benace* marino.

[5] Maffei (Verona Illustrata, part i. p. 95. 129. 221. part ii. p. ii. 6.) has illustrated with taste and learning this interesting topography. He places the interview of Attila and St. Leo near Ariolica, or Ardelica, now Peschiera, at the conflux of the lake and river; ascertains the villa of Catullus, in the delightful peninsula of Sarmio, and discovers the Andes of Virgil, in the village of Bandes, precisely situate, quâ se subducere colles incipiunt, where the Veronese hills imperceptibly slope down into the plain of Mantua.

shepherds of the North, whose ordinary food consisted of milk and raw flesh, indulged themselves too freely in the use of bread, of wine, and of meat, prepared and seasoned by the arts of cookery; and the progress of disease revenged in some measure the injuries of the Italians.[1] When Attila declared his resolution of carrying his victorious arms to the gates of Rome, he was admonished by his friends, as well as by his enemies, that Alaric had not long survived the conquest of the eternal city. His mind, superior to real danger, was assaulted by imaginary terrors; nor could he escape the influence of superstition, which had so often been subservient to his designs.[2] The pressing eloquence of Leo, his majestic aspect, and sacerdotal robes, excited the veneration of Attila for the spiritual father of the Christians. The apparition of the two apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, who menaced the Barbarian with instant death, if he rejected the prayer of their successor, is one of the noblest legends of ecclesiastical tradition. The safety of Rome might deserve the interposition of celestial beings; and some indulgence is due to a fable, which has been represented by the pencil of Raphael, and the chisel of Algardi.[3]

Before the king of the Huns evacuated Italy, he threatened to return more dreadful, and more implacable, if his bride, the princess Honoria, were not delivered to his ambassadors within the term stipulated by the treaty. Yet, in the mean while, Attila relieved his tender anxiety, by adding a beautiful maid, whose name was Ildico, to the list of his innumerable wives.[4] Their marriage was celebrated with barbaric pomp and festivity, at his wooden palace beyond the Danube; and the monarch, oppressed with wine and sleep, retired, at a late hour, from the banquet to the nuptial bed. His attendants continued to respect his pleasures, or his repose, the greatest part of the ensuing day, till the unusual silence alarmed their fears and suspicions; and, after attempting to awaken Attila by loud and repeated cries, they at length broke into the royal apartment. They found the trembling bride sitting by the bedside, hiding her face with her veil, and lamenting her own danger, as well as the death (A.D. 453) of the king, who had expired during the night.[5] An artery had suddenly burst; and as Attila

[1] Si statim infesto agmine urbem petiissent, grande discrimen esset: sed in Venetiâ quo fere tractu Italia mollissima est, ipsâ soli cœlique clementiâ robur elanguit. Adhoc panis usû carnisque coctæ, et dulcedine vini mitigatos, &c. This passage of Florus (iii. 3.) is still more applicable to the Huns than to the Cimbri, and it may serve as a commentary on the *celestial* plague, with which Idatius and Isidore have afflicted the troops of Attila.

[2] The historian Priscus has positively mentioned the effect which this example produced on the mind of Attila. Jornan. c. 42. p. 673.

[3] The picture of Raphael is in the Vatican; the basso (or perhaps the alto) relievo of Algardi, on one of the altars of Peter's (Dubos, Reflex. sur la Poesie et sur la Peinture, i. 519.). Baron. (Annal. Eccles. A.D. 452. No. 57, 58.) bravely sustains the truth of the apparition; which is rejected, however, by the most learned and pious Catholics.

[4] Attila, ut Priscus historicus refert, extinctionis suæ tempore, puellam Ildico nomine, decoram valde, sibi matrimonium post innumerabiles uxores . . . socians. Jornan. c. 49. p. 683. He afterwards adds (c. 50. p. 686.) Filii Attilæ, quorum per licentiam libidinis pœne populus fuit. Polygamy has been established among the Tartars of every age. But in royal families, the daughters of Khans communicate to their sons a prior right of inheritance. Genealog. History p. 406.

[5] The report of her *guilt* reached Constantinople, where it obtained a very different name; and Marcellinus observes, that the tyrant of Europe was slain in the night by the hand, and the knife, of a woman. Corneille, who has adapted the genuine account to his tragedy, describes the irruption of blood in forty bombast lines, and Attila exclaims, with ridiculous fury,

—— S'il ne veut s'arreter (*his blood*), (Dit-il) on me payera ce qui m'en va couter,

lay in a supine posture, he was suffocated by a torrent of blood, which, instead of finding a passage through the nostrils, regurgitated into the lungs and stomach. His body was solemnly exposed in the midst of the plain, under a silken pavilion; and the chosen squadrons of the Huns, wheeling round in measured evolutions, chaunted a funeral song to the memory of a hero, glorious in his life, invincible in his death, the father of his people, the scourge of his enemies, and the terror of the world. According to their national custom, the Barbarians cut off a part of their hair, gashed their faces with unseemly wounds, and bewailed their valiant leader as he deserved, not with the tears of women, but with the blood of warriors. The remains of Attila were inclosed within three coffins, of gold, of silver, and of iron, and privately buried in the night: the spoils of nations were thrown into his grave; the captives who had opened the ground were inhumanly massacred; and the same Huns, who had indulged such excessive grief, feasted, with dissolute and intemperate mirth, about the recent sepulchre of their king. It was reported at Constantinople, that on the fortunate night in which he expired, Marcian beheld in a dream the bow of Attila broken asunder: and the report may be allowed to prove, how seldom the image of that formidable Barbarian was absent from the mind of a Roman emperor.[1]

The revolution which subverted the empire of the Huns, established the fame of Attila, whose genius alone had sustained the huge and disjointed fabric. After his death, the boldest chieftains aspired to the rank of kings; the most powerful kings refused to acknowledge a superior; and the numerous sons, whom so many various mothers bore to the deceased monarch, divided and disputed, like a private inheritance, the sovereign command of the nations of Germany and Scythia. The bold Ardaric felt and represented the disgrace of this servile partition; and his subjects, the warlike Gepidæ, with the Ostrogoths, under the conduct of three valiant brothers, encouraged their allies to vindicate the rights of freedom and royalty. In a bloody and decisive conflict on the banks of the river Netad, in Pannonia, the lance of the Gepidæ, the sword of the Goths, the arrows of the Huns, the Suevic infantry, the light arms of the Heruli, and the heavy weapons of the Alani, encountered or supported each other; and the victory of Ardaric was accompanied with the slaughter of 30,000 of his enemies. Ellac, the eldest son of Attila, lost his life and crown in the memorable battle of Netad: his early valour had raised him to the throne of the Acatzires, a Scythian people, whom he subdued; and his father, who loved the superior merit, would have envied the death, of Ellac.[2] His brother Dengisich, with an army of Huns, still formidable in their flight and ruin, maintained his ground above fifteen years on the banks of the Danube. The palace of Attila, with the old country of Dacia, from the Carpathian hills to the Euxine, became the

[1] The curious circumstances of the death and funeral of Attila, are related by Jornan. (c. 49. p. 683.), and were probably transcribed from Priscus.

[2] Jornan. de Reb. Get. c. 50. p. 685. His distinction of the national arms is curious and important. Nam ibi admirandum reor fuisse spectaculum, ubi cernere erat cunctis, pugnantem Gothum ense furentem, Gepidam in vulnere suorum cuncta tela frangentem, Suevum pede, Hunnum sagittâ præsumere, Alanum gravi, Herulum levi, armaturâ, aciem instruere. I am not precisely informed of the situation of the river Netad.

seat of a new power, which was erected by Ardaric, king of the Gepidæ. The Pannonian conquests, from Vienna to Sirmium, were occupied by the Ostrogoths; and the settlements of the tribes, who had so bravely asserted their native freedom, were irregularly distributed, according to the measure of their respective strength. Surrounded and oppressed by the multitude of his father's slaves, the kingdom of Dengisich was confined to the circle of his waggons; his desperate courage urged him to invade the Eastern empire; he fell in battle; and his head, ignominiously exposed in the Hippodrome, exhibited a grateful spectacle to the people of Constantinople. Attila had fondly or superstitiously believed, that Irnac, the youngest of his sons, was destined to perpetuate the glories of his race. The character of that prince, who attempted to moderate the rashness of his brother Dengisich, was more suitable to the declining condition of the Huns; and Irnac, with his subject hordes, retired into the heart of the Lesser Scythia. They were soon overwhelmed by a torrent of new Barbarians, who followed the same road which their own ancestors had formerly discovered. The *Geougen*, or Avares, whose residence is assigned by the Greek writers to the shores of the ocean, impelled the adjacent tribes; till at length the Igours of the North, issuing from the cold Siberian regions, which produce the most valuable furs, spread themselves over the desert, as far as the Boristhenes and Caspian gates; and finally extinguished the empire of the Huns.[1]

Such an event might contribute to the safety of the Eastern empire, under the reign of a prince, who conciliated the friendship, without forfeiting the esteem, of the Barbarians. But the emperor of the West, the feeble and dissolute Valentinian, who had reached his 35th year without attaining the age of reason or courage, abused (A.D. 454) this apparent security, to undermine the foundations of his own throne, by the murder of the patrician Ætius. From the instinct of a base and jealous mind, he hated the man who was universally celebrated as the terror of the Barbarians, and the support of the republic; and his new favourite, the eunuch Heraclius, awakened the emperor from the supine lethargy, which might be disguised, during the life of Placidia,[2] by the exercise of filial piety. The fame of Ætius, his wealth and dignity, the numerous and martial train of Barbarian followers, his powerful dependents, who filled the civil offices of the state, and the hopes of his son Gaudentius, who was already contracted to Eudoxia, the emperor's daughter, had raised him above the rank of a subject. The ambitious designs, of which he was secretly accused, excited the fears, as well as the resentment, of Valentinian. Ætius himself, supported by the consciousness of his merit, his services, and perhaps his innocence, seems to have maintained a haughty and indiscreet behaviour. The patrician offended his sovereign by an hostile declaration; he aggravated the offence, by compelling him to ratify, with a

[1] Two modern historians have thrown much new light on the ruin and division of the empire of Attila. M. de Buat, by his laborious and minute diligence (viii. p. 3—31, 68—94.); and M. de Guignes, by his extraordinary knowledge of the Chinese language and writers. Hist. des Huns, ii. 315.

[2] Placidia died at Rome, Nov. 27, A.D. 450. She was buried at Ravenna, where her sepulchre, and even her corpse, seated in a chair of cypress wood, were preserved for ages. The empress received many compliments from the orthodox clergy. Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. vi. 240.

solemn oath, a treaty of reconciliation and alliance; he proclaimed his suspicions, he neglected his safety; and from a vain confidence that the enemy, whom he despised, was incapable even of a manly crime, he rashly ventured his person in the palace of Rome. Whilst he urged, perhaps with intemperate vehemence, the marriage of his son; Valentinian, drawing his sword, the first sword he had ever drawn, plunged it in the breast of a general who had saved his empire: his courtiers and eunuchs ambitiously struggled to imitate their master; and Ætius, pierced with an hundred wounds, fell dead in the royal presence. Boethius, the Prætorian præfect, was killed at the same moment; and before the event could be divulged, the principal friends of the patrician were summoned to the palace, and separately murdered. The horrid deed, palliated by the specious names of justice and necessity was immediately communicated by the emperor to his soldiers, his subjects, and his allies. The nations, who were strangers or enemies to Ætius, generously deplored the unworthy fate of a hero: the Barbarians, who had been attached to his service, dissembled their grief and resentment; and the public contempt, which had been so long entertained for Valentinian, was at once converted into deep and universal abhorrence. Such sentiments seldom pervade the walls of a palace; yet the emperor was confounded by the honest reply of a Roman, whose approbation he had not disdained to solicit. "I am "ignorant, Sir, of your motives or provocations; I only know, that "you have acted like a man who cuts off his right hand with his left."[1]

The luxury of Rome seems to have attracted the long and frequent visits of Valentinian; who was consequently more despised at Rome, than in any other part of his dominions. A republican spirit was insensibly revived in the senate, as their authority, and even their supplies, became necessary for the support of this feeble government. The stately demeanour of an hereditary monarch offended their pride; and the pleasures of Valentinian were injurious to the peace and honour of noble families. The birth of the empress Eudoxia was equal to his own, and her charms and tender affection deserved those testimonies of love, which her inconstant husband dissipated in vague and unlawful amours. Petronius Maximus, a wealthy senator of the Anician family, who had been twice consul, was possessed of a chaste and beautiful wife: her obstinate resistance served only to irritate the desires of Valentinian, and he resolved to accomplish them either by stratagem or force. Deep gaming was one of the vices of the court: the emperor, who, by chance or contrivance, had gained from Maximus a considerable sum, uncourteously exacted his ring as a security for the debt; and sent it by a trusty messenger to his wife, with an order, in her husband's name, that she should immediately attend the empress Eudoxia. The unsuspecting wife of Maximus was conveyed in her litter to the Imperial palace; the emissaries of her impatient lover conducted her to a remote and silent bed-chamber; and Valentinian violated, without remorse, the laws of hospitality. Her tears, when she returned home; her deep affliction; and her bitter reproaches

[1] Aetium Placidus mactavit semivir amens, is the expression of Sidonius (Paneg. Avit. 359.). The poet knew the world, and was not inclined to flatter a minister who had injured or disgraced Avitus and Majorian, the successive heroes of his song.

against her husband, whom she considered as the accomplice of his own shame, excited Maximus to a just revenge; the desire of revenge was stimulated by ambition; and he might reasonably aspire, by the free suffrage of the Roman senate, to the throne of a detested and despicable rival. Valentinian, who supposed that every human breast was devoid, like his own, of friendship and gratitude, had imprudently admitted among his guards several domestics and followers of Ætius. Two of these, of Barbarian race, were persuaded to execute a sacred and honourable duty, by punishing with death the assassin of their patron; and their intrepid courage did not long expect a favourable moment. Whilst Valentinian amused himself in the field of Mars with the spectacle of some military sports, they suddenly rushed upon him with drawn weapons, dispatched the guilty Heraclius, and (A.D. 455. Mar. 16) stabbed the emperor to the heart, without the least opposition from his numerous train, who seemed to rejoice in the tyrant's death. Such was the fate of Valentinian the Third,[1] the last Roman emperor of the family of Theodosius. He faithfully imitated the hereditary weakness of his cousin and his two uncles, without inheriting the gentleness, the purity, the innocence, which alleviate, in their characters, the want of spirit and ability. Valentinian was less excusable, since he had passions, without virtues: even his religion was questionable; and though he never deviated into the paths of heresy, he scandalized the pious Christians by his attachment to the profane arts of magic and divination.

As early as the time of Cicero and Varro, it was the opinion of the Roman augurs, that the *twelve vultures*, which Romulus had seen, represented the *twelve centuries*, assigned for the fatal period of his city.[2] This prophecy, disregarded perhaps in the season of health and prosperity, inspired the people with gloomy apprehensions, when the twelfth century, clouded with disgrace and misfortune, was almost elapsed;[3] and even posterity must acknowledge, with some surprise, that the arbitrary interpretation of an accidental or fabulous circumstance, has been seriously verified in the downfall of the Western empire. But its fall was announced by a clearer omen than the flight of vultures; the Roman government appeared every day less formidable to its enemies, more odious and oppressive to its subjects.[4] The

[1] With regard to the cause and circumstances of the deaths of Ætius and Valentinian, our information is dark and imperfect. Procop. (de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 4. p. 186.) is a fabulous writer for the events which precede his own memory. His narrative must therefore be supplied and corrected by five or six Chronicles, none of which were composed in Rome or Italy; and which can only express, in broken sentences, the popular rumours, as they were conveyed to Gaul, Spain, Africa, Constantinople, or Alexandria.

[2] This interpretation of Vettius, a celebrated augur, was quoted by Varro, in the xviiith book of his Antiquities. Censorinus, de Die Natali, c. 17. p. 90. ed. Havercamp.

[3] According to Varro, the twelfth century would expire A.D. 447, but the uncertainty of the true æra of Rome might allow some latitude of anticipation or delay. The poets of the age, Claudian (de Bell. Getico, 265.) and Sidonius (in Paneg. Avit. 357.), may be admitted as fair witnesses of the popular opinion.

Jam reputant annos, interceptoque volatû
Vulturis, incidunt properatis sæcula metis.

* * * * *

Jam prope fata tui bissenas Vulturis alas
Implebant; scis namque tuos, scis, Roma, labores,

See Dubos, Hist. Critique, i. 340.

[4] The fifth book of Salvian is filled with pathetic lamentations, and vehement invectives,

taxes were multiplied with the public distress, economy was neglected in proportion as it became necessary; and the injustice of the rich shifted the unequal burden from themselves to the people, whom they defrauded of the *indulgencies* that might sometimes have alleviated their misery. The severe inquisition, which confiscated their goods, and tortured their persons, compelled the subjects of Valentinian to prefer the more simple tyranny of the Barbarians, to fly to the woods and mountains, or to embrace the vile and abject condition of mercenary servants. They abjured and abhorred the name of Roman citizens, which had formerly excited the ambition of mankind. The Armorican provinces of Gaul, and the greatest part of Spain, were thrown into a state of disorderly independence, by the confederations of the Bagaudæ; and the Imperial ministers pursued with proscriptive laws, and ineffectual arms, the rebels whom they had made.[1] If all the Barbarian conquerors had been annihilated in the same hour, their total destruction would not have restored the empire of the West: and if Rome still survived, she survived the loss of freedom, of virtue, and of honour.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

Sack of Rome by Genseric, King of the Vandals.—His naval Depredations.—Succession of the last Emperors of the West, Maximus, Avitus, Majorian, Severus, Anthemius, Olybrius, Glycerius, Nepos, Augustulus.—Total Extinction of the Western Empire.—Reign of Odoacer, the first Barbarian King of Italy.

THE loss or desolation of the provinces, from the ocean to the Alps, impaired the glory and greatness of Rome: her internal prosperity was irretrievably destroyed by the separation of Africa. The rapacious Vandals confiscated the patrimonial estates of the senators, and intercepted the regular subsidies, which relieved the poverty, and encouraged the idleness, of the plebeians. The distress of the Romans was soon aggravated by an unexpected attack; and the province, so long cultivated for their use by industrious and obedient subjects, was armed against them by an ambitious Barbarian. The Vandals and Alani, who followed the successful standard of Genseric, had acquired

His immoderate freedom serves to prove the weakness, as well as the corruption, of the Roman government. His book was published after the loss of Africa (A.D. 439.), and before Attila's war (A.D. 451.).

[1] The Bagaudæ of Spain, who fought pitched battles with the Roman troops, are repeatedly mentioned in the Chronicle of Idatius. Salvian has described their distress and rebellion in very forcible language. Itaque nomen civium Romanorum . . . nunc ultro repudiatur ac fugitur, nec vile tamen sed etiam abominabile pœne habetur. . . . . Et hinc est ut etiam hi qui ad Barbaros non confugiunt, Barbari tamen esse coguntur, scilicet ut est pars magna Hispanorum, et non minima Gallorum. . . . . De Bagaudis nunc mihi sermo est, qui per malos judices et cruentos spoliati, afflicti, necati postquam jus Romanæ libertatis amiserant, etiam honorem Romani nominis perdiderunt. . . . . Vocamus rebelles, vocamus perditos quos esse compulimus criminosos. De Gub. Dei, l. v. p. 158, 159.

(A.D. 439—455) a rich and fertile territory, which stretched along the coast above ninety days' journey from Tangier to Tripoli; but their narrow limits were pressed and confined, on either side, by the sandy desert and the Mediterranean. The discovery and conquest of the Black nations, that might dwell beneath the torrid zone, could not tempt the rational ambition of Genseric: but he cast his eyes towards the sea; he resolved to create a naval power, and his bold resolution was executed with steady and active perseverance. The woods of mount Atlas afforded an inexhaustible nursery of timber; his new subjects were skilled in the arts of navigation and ship-building; he animated his daring Vandals to embrace a mode of warfare which would render every maritime country accessible to their arms; the Moors and Africans were allured by the hopes of plunder; and, after an interval of six centuries, the fleets that issued from the port of Carthage again claimed the empire of the Mediterranean. The success of the Vandals, the conquest of Sicily, the sack of Palermo, and the frequent descents on the coast of Lucania, awakened and alarmed the mother of Valentinian, and the sister of Theodosius. Alliances were formed; and armaments, expensive and ineffectual, were prepared, for the destruction of the common enemy; who reserved his courage to encounter those dangers which his policy could not prevent or elude. The designs of the Roman government were repeatedly baffled by his artful delays, ambiguous promises, and apparent concessions; and the interposition of his formidable confederate the king of the Huns, recalled the emperors from the conquest of Africa to the care of their domestic safety. The revolutions of the palace, which left the Western empire without a defender, and without a lawful prince, dispelled the apprehensions, and stimulated the avarice, of Genseric. He immediately equipped a numerous fleet of Vandals and Moors, and cast anchor at the mouth of the Tyber, about three months after the death of Valentinian, and the elevation of Maximus to the Imperial throne.

The private life of the senator Petronius Maximus,[1] was often alleged as a rare example of human felicity. His birth was noble and illustrious, since he descended from the Anician family; his dignity was supported by an adequate patrimony in land and money: and these advantages of fortune were accompanied with liberal arts, and decent manners, which adorn or imitate the inestimable gifts of genius and virtue. The luxury of his palace and table was hospitable and elegant. Whenever Maximus appeared in public, he was surrounded by a train of grateful and obsequious clients;[2] and it is possible that among these clients, he might deserve and possess some real friends. His merit was rewarded by the favour of the prince and senate: he thrice exercised the office of Prætorian præfect of Italy; he was twice invested with the consulship, and he obtained the rank of patrician. These civil honours were not incompatible with the enjoyment of leisure and tranquillity; his hours, according to the demands

[1] Sidonius Apollinaris composed Epist. xiii. Book ii., to refute the paradox of his friend Serranus, who entertained a singular, though generous, enthusiasm for the deceased emperor. This epistle, with some indulgence, may claim the praise of an elegant composition; and it throws much light on the character of Maximus.

[2] Clientum, prævia, pedisequa, circumfusa, populositas, is the train which Sidonius himself (l. i. epist. 9.) assigns to another senator of consular rank.

of pleasure or reason, were accurately distributed by a water-clock; and this avarice of time may be allowed to prove the sense which Maximus entertained of his own happiness. The injury which he received from the emperor Valentinian, appears to excuse the most bloody revenge. A patriot would have hesitated, before he plunged himself and his country into those inevitable calamities, which must follow the extinction of the royal house of Theodosius. The imprudent Maximus disregarded these salutary considerations: he gratified his resentment and ambition; he saw the bleeding corpse of Valentinian at his feet; and he heard himself saluted emperor by the unanimous voice of the senate and people. But the day of his inauguration was the last day of his happiness. He was imprisoned (such is the lively expression of Sidonius) in the palace; and after passing a sleepless night he sighed, that he had attained the summit of his wishes, and aspired only to descend from the dangerous elevation. Oppressed by the weight of the diadem, he communicated his anxious thoughts to his friend and quæstor Fulgentius; and when he looked back with unavailing regret on the secure pleasures of his former life, the emperor exclaimed, "O fortunate Damocles,[1] thy reign began and "ended with the same dinner:" a well-known allusion, which Fulgentius afterwards repeated as an instructive lesson for princes and subjects.

The reign of Maximus continued about three months. His hours, of which he had lost the command, were disturbed by remorse, or guilt, or error, and his throne was shaken by the seditions of the soldiers, the people, and the confederate Barbarians. The marriage of his son Palladius with the eldest daughter of the late emperor, might tend to establish the hereditary succession of his family; but the violence which he offered to the empress Eudoxia, could proceed only from the blind impulse of lust or revenge. His own wife, the cause of these tragic events, had been seasonably removed by death; and the widow of Valentinian was compelled to violate her decent mourning, perhaps her real grief, and to submit to the embraces of a presumptuous usurper, whom she suspected as the assassin of her deceased husband. These suspicions were soon justified by the indiscreet confession of Maximus himself; and he wantonly provoked the hatred of his reluctant bride, who was still conscious that she descended from a line of emperors. From the East, however, Eudoxia could not hope to obtain any effectual assistance: her father and her aunt Pulcheria were dead; her mother languished at Jerusalem in disgrace and exile; and the sceptre of Constantinople was in the hands of a stranger. She directed her eyes towards Carthage; secretly implored the aid of the king of the Vandals; and persuaded Genseric to improve the fair opportunity of disguising his rapacious designs by the specious names of honour, justice, and compassion.[2]

[1] Districtus ensis cui super impiâ Cervice pendet, non *Siculæ dapes* Dulcem elaborabunt saporem: Non avium Citharæque cantus Somnum reducent.
Horat. Carm. iii. 1.

Sidonius concludes his letter with the story of Damocles, which Cicero (Tusculan. v. 20, 21.) had so inimitably told.

[2] Notwithstanding the evidence of Procop., Evagr., Idat., Marcellin., &c., the learned Muratori (Annali d'Italia, iv. 249.) doubts the reality of this invitation, and observes, with

Whatever abilities Maximus might have shown in a subordinate station, he was found incapable of administering an empire; and though he might easily have been informed of the naval preparations, which were made on the opposite shores of Africa, he expected with supine indifference the approach of the enemy, without adopting any measures of defence, of negociation, or of a timely retreat. When the Vandals disembarked at the mouth of the Tyber, the emperor was suddenly roused from his lethargy by the clamours of a trembling and exasperated multitude. The only hope which presented itself to his astonished mind was that of a precipitate flight, and he exhorted the senators to imitate the example of their prince. But no sooner did Maximus appear (A.D. 455. June 12) in the streets, than he was assaulted by a shower of stones: a Roman, or a Burgundian, soldier claimed the honour of the first wound; his mangled body was ignominiously cast into the Tyber; the Roman people rejoiced in the punishment which they had inflicted on the author of the public calamities; and the domestics of Eudoxia signalized their zeal in the service of their mistress.[1]

On the third day after the tumult, Genseric boldly advanced from the port of Ostia to the gates of the defenceless city. Instead of a sally of the Roman youth, there issued from the gates an unarmed and venerable procession of the bishop at the head of his clergy.[2] The fearless spirit of Leo, his authority and eloquence, *again* mitigated the fierceness of a Barbarian conqueror: the king of the Vandals promised to spare the unresisting multitude, to protect the buildings from fire, and to exempt the captives from torture; and although such orders were neither seriously given, nor strictly obeyed, the mediation of Leo was glorious to himself, and in some degree beneficial to his country. But Rome, and its inhabitants, were (June 15—29) delivered to the licentiousness of the Vandals and Moors, whose blind passions revenged the injuries of Carthage. The pillage lasted fourteen days and nights; and all that yet remained of public or private wealth, of sacred or profane treasure, was diligently transported to the vessels of Genseric. Among the spoils, the splendid relics of two temples, or rather of two religions, exhibited a memorable example of the vicissitude of human and divine things. Since the abolition of Paganism, the Capitol had been violated and abandoned; yet the statues of the gods and heroes were still respected, and the curious roof of gilt bronze was reserved for the rapacious hands of Genseric.[3] The holy instru-

great truth, "Non si può dir quanto sia facile il popolo a sognare e spacciar voci false." But his argument, from the interval of time and place, is extremely feeble. The figs which grew near Carthage were produced to the senate of Rome on the third day.

[1] . . . . Infidoque tibi Burgundio ductu Extorquet trepidas mactandi principis iras.
Sidon. in Paneg. Avit. 442.
A remarkable line, which insinuates that Rome and Maximus were betrayed by their Burgundian mercenaries.

[2] The apparent success of pope Leo may be justified by Prosper, and the *Hist. Miscellan.*; but the improbable notion of Baron. (A.D. 455. No. 13.), that Genseric spared the three apostolical churches, is not countenanced even by the doubtful testimony of the *Liber Pontificalis.*

[3] The profusion of Catulus, the first who gilt the roof of the Capitol, was not universally approved (Plin. Hist. Natur. xxxiii. 18.); but it was far exceeded by the emperor's, and the external gilding of the temple cost Domitian 12,000 talents (£2,400,000.). The expressions of Claudian and Rutilius (*luce metalli æmula . . . . fastigia astris*, and *confunduntque vagos*

ments of the Jewish worship,[1] the gold table and the gold candlestick with seven branches, originally framed according to the particular instructions of God himself, and which were placed in the sanctuary of his temple, had been ostentatiously displayed to the Roman people in the triumph of Titus. They were afterwards deposited in the temple of Peace; and at the end of 400 years, the spoils of Jerusalem were transferred from Rome to Carthage, by a Barbarian who derived his origin from the shores of the Baltic. These ancient monuments might attract the notice of curiosity, as well as of avarice. But the Christian churches, enriched and adorned by the prevailing superstition of the times, afforded more plentiful materials for sacrilege; and the pious liberality of pope Leo, who melted six silver vases, the gift of Constantine, each of an hundred pounds weight, is an evidence of the damage which he attempted to repair. In the forty-five years, that had elapsed since the Gothic invasion, the pomp and luxury of Rome were in some measure restored; and it was difficult either to escape, or to satisfy, the avarice of a conqueror, who possessed leisure to collect, and ships to transport, the wealth of the capital. The imperial ornaments of the palace, the magnificent furniture and wardrobe, the sideboards of massy plate, were accumulated with disorderly rapine: the gold and silver amounted to several thousand talents; yet even the brass and copper were laboriously removed. Eudoxia herself, who advanced to meet her friend and deliverer, soon bewailed the imprudence of her own conduct. She was rudely stripped of her jewels; and the unfortunate empress, with her two daughters, the only surviving remains of the great Theodosius, was compelled, as a captive, to follow the haughty Vandal; who immediately hoisted sail, and returned with a prosperous navigation to the port of Carthage.[2] Many thousand Romans of both sexes, chosen for some useful or agreeable qualifications, reluctantly embarked on board the fleet of Genseric; and their distress was aggravated by the unfeeling Barbarians, who, in the division of the booty, separated the wives from their husbands, and the children from their parents. The charity of Deogratias, bishop of Carthage,[3] was their only consolation and support. He generously sold the gold and silver plate of the church to purchase the freedom of some, to alleviate the slavery of others, and to assist the wants and infirmities of a captive multitude, whose health was impaired by the hardships which they had suffered in the passage from Italy to Africa. By his order, two spacious churches were converted into hospitals: the sick were distributed in convenient beds, and liberally supplied with food and medicines; and the aged prelate repeated his visits both in

delubra micantia visus) manifestly prove, that this splendid covering was not removed either by the Christians or the Goths (Donatus, Roma Antiqua, l. ii. c. 6. p. 125.). It should seem, that the roof of the Capitol was decorated with gilt statues, and chariots drawn by four horses.

[1] The curious reader may consult the learned and accurate treatise of Hadrian Reland, de Spoliis Templi Hierosolymitani in Arcû Titiano Romæ conspicuis, in 12mo. Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1716.

[2] The vessel which transported the relics of the Capitol, was the only one of the whole fleet that suffered shipwreck. If a bigoted sophist, a Pagan bigot, had mentioned the accident, he might have rejoiced that this cargo of sacrilege was lost in the sea.

[3] Vic. Vitensis, de Persec. Vand. l. i. c. 8. p. 11. ed. Ruinart. Deogratias governed the church of Carthage only three years. If he had not been privately buried, his corpse would have been torn piecemeal by the mad devotion of the people.

the day and night, with an assiduity that surpassed his strength, and a tender sympathy which enhanced the value of his services. Compare this scene with the field of Cannæ; and judge between Hannibal and the successor of St. Cyprian.[1]

The deaths of Ætius and Valentinian had relaxed the ties which held the Barbarians of Gaul in peace and subordination. The sea-coast was infested by the Saxons; the Alemanni and the Franks advanced from the Rhine to the Seine; and the ambition of the Goths seemed to meditate more extensive and permanent conquests. The emperor Maximus relieved himself, by a judicious choice, from the weight of these distant cares; he silenced the solicitations of his friends, listened to the voice of fame, and promoted (A.D. 455. July 10) a stranger to the general command of the forces in Gaul. Avitus,[2] the stranger, whose merit was so nobly rewarded, descended from a wealthy and honourable family in the diocese of Auvergne. The convulsions of the times urged him to embrace, with the same ardour, the civil and military professions; and the indefatigable youth blended the studies of literature and jurisprudence with the exercise of arms and hunting. Thirty years of his life were laudably spent in the public service; he alternately displayed his talents in war and negociation; and the soldier of Ætius, after executing the most important embassies, was raised to the station of Prætorian præfect of Gaul. Either the merit of Avitus excited envy, or his moderation was desirous of repose, since he calmly retired to an estate, which he possessed in the neighbourhood of Clermont. A copious stream, issuing from the mountain, and falling headlong in many a loud and foaming cascade, discharged its waters into a lake about two miles in length, and the villa was pleasantly seated on the margin of the lake. The baths, the porticoes, the summer and winter apartments, were adapted to the purposes of luxury and use; and the adjacent country afforded the various prospects of woods, pastures, and meadows.[3] In this retreat, where Avitus amused his leisure with books, rural sports, the practice of husbandry, and the society of his friends,[4] he received the Imperial diploma, which constituted him master-general of the cavalry and infantry of Gaul. He assumed the military command; the Barbarians suspended their fury; and whatever means he might employ, whatever concessions he might be forced to make, the people enjoyed the benefits of actual tranquillity. But the fate of Gaul de-

[1] The general evidence for the death of Maximus, and the sack of Rome by the Vandals, is comprised in Sidon. (Paneg. Avit. 441.), Procop. (de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 4, 5. p. 188. and l. ii. c. 9. p. 255.), Evag. (l. ii. c. 7.), Jornan. (de Reb. Get. c. 45. p. 677.) and the Chron. of Idat., Prosper, Marcellin., and Theophan., under the proper year.

[2] The private life and elevation of Avitus must be deduced, with becoming suspicion, from the panegyric pronounced by Sidon. Apollin. his subject, and his son-in-law.

[3] After the example of the younger Pliny, Sidon. (l. ii. c. 2.) has laboured the florid, prolix, and obscure description of his villa, which bore the name (*Avitacum*) and had been the property of Avitus. The precise situation is not ascertained. Consult however the notes of Savaron and Sirmond.

[4] Sidon. (l. ii. epist. 9.) has described the country life of the Gallic nobles, in a visit which he made to his friends, whose estates were in the neighbourhood of Nismes. The morning hours were spent in the *sphæristerium*, or tennis-court; or in the library, which was furnished with *Latin* authors, profane and religious; the former for the men, the latter for the ladies. The table was twice served, at dinner and supper, with hot meat (boiled and roast) and wine. During the intermediate time, the company slept, took the air on horseback, and used the warm bath.

pended on the Visigoths; and the Roman general, less attentive to his dignity than to the public interest, did not disdain to visit Thoulouse in the character of an ambassador. He was received with courteous hospitality by Theodoric, the king of the Goths; but while Avitus laid the foundations of a solid alliance with that powerful nation, he was astonished by the intelligence, that the emperor Maximus was slain, and that Rome had been pillaged by the Vandals. A vacant throne, which he might ascend without guilt or danger, tempted his ambition;[1] and the Visigoths were easily persuaded to support his claim by their irresistible suffrage. They loved the person of Avitus; they respected his virtues; and they were not insensible of the advantage, as well as honour, of giving an emperor to the West. The season was now approaching, in which the annual assembly of the seven provinces was held at Arles; their deliberations might perhaps be influenced by the presence of Theodoric, and his martial brothers; but their choice would naturally incline to the most illustrious of their countrymen. Avitus, after a decent resistance, accepted (A.D. 455. Aug. 15) the Imperial diadem from the representatives of Gaul; and his election was ratified by the acclamations of the Barbarians and provincials. The formal consent of Marcian, emperor of the East, was solicited and obtained: but the senate, Rome, and Italy, though humbled by their recent calamities, submitted with a secret murmur to the presumption of the Gallic usurper.

Theodoric, to whom Avitus was indebted for the purple, had acquired the Gothic sceptre (A.D. 453—466) by the murder of his elder brother Torismond; and he justified this atrocious deed by the design which his predecessor had formed of violating his alliance with the empire.[2] Such a crime might not be incompatible with the virtues of a Barbarian; but the manners of Theodoric were gentle and humane; and posterity may contemplate without terror the original picture of a Gothic king, whom Sidonius had intimately observed, in the hours of peace and of social intercourse. In an epistle, dated from the court of Thoulouse, the orator satisfies the curiosity of one of his friends, in the following description:[3] "By the majesty of his appear-"ance, Theodoric would command the respect of those who are ignor-"ant of his merit; and although he is born a prince, his merit "would dignify a private station. He is of a middle stature, his body "appears rather plump than fat, and in his well-proportioned limbs "agility is united with muscular strength.[4] If you examine his coun-"tenance, you will distinguish a high forehead, large shaggy eye-

[1] Seventy lines of Panegyric (505—575.), which describe the importunity of Theodoric and of Gaul, struggling to overcome the modest reluctance of Avitus, are blown away by three words of an honest historian. Romanum *ambisset* Imperium (Greg. Turon. l. ii. c. 11. ii. 168.).

[2] Isidore, archbishop of Seville, who was himself of the blood-royal of the Goths, acknowledges, and almost justifies (Hist. Goth. p. 718.) the crime which their slave Jornandes had basely dissembled (c. 43. p. 673.).

[3] This elaborate description (l. i. ep. ii. p. 2.) was dictated by some political motive. It was designed for the public eye, and had been shown by the friends of Sidonius, before it was inserted in the collection of his epistles. The first book was published separately. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xvi. 264.

[4] I have suppressed, in this portrait of Theodoric, several minute circumstances, and technical phrases, which could be tolerable, or indeed intelligible, to those only who, like the contemporaries of Sidonius, had frequented the markets where naked slaves were exposed to sale (Dubos, Hist. Crit. i. 404.).

"brows, an aquiline nose, thin lips, a regular set of white teeth, and a "fair complexion, that blushes more frequently from modesty than "from anger. The ordinary distribution of his time, as far as it is ex- "posed to the public view, may be concisely represented. Before "daybreak, he repairs, with a small train, to his domestic chapel, "where the service is performed by the Arian clergy; but those who "presume to interpret his secret sentiments, consider this assiduous "devotion as the effect of habit and policy. The rest of the morning "is employed in the administration of his kingdom. His chair is "surrounded by some military officers of decent aspect and behaviour: "the noisy crowd of his Barbarian guards occupies the hall of audi- "ence; but they are not permitted to stand within the veils or cur- "tains, that conceal the council-chamber from vulgar eyes. The "ambassadors of the nations are successively introduced: Theodoric "listens with attention, answers them with discreet brevity, and either "announces or delays, according to the nature of their business, his "final resolution. About eight (the second hour) he rises from his "throne, and visits, either his treasury, or his stables. If he chuses "to hunt, or at least to exercise himself on horseback, his bow is "carried by a favourite youth; but when the game is marked, he "bends it with his own hand, and seldom misses the object of his "aim: as a king, he disdains to bear arms in such ignoble warfare, "but as a soldier, he would blush to accept any military service which "he could perform himself. On common days, his dinner is not "different from the repast of a private citizen; but every Saturday, "many honourable guests are invited to the royal table, which, on "these occasions, is served with the elegance of Greece, the plenty of "Gaul, and the order and diligence of Italy.[1] The gold or silver "plate is less remarkable for its weight, than for the brightness and "curious workmanship: the taste is gratified without the help of "foreign and costly luxury; the size and number of the cups of wine "are regulated with a strict regard to the laws of temperance; and "the respectful silence that prevails, is interrupted only by grave and "instructive conversation. After dinner, Theodoric sometimes in- "dulges himself in a short slumber; and as soon as he wakes, he calls "for the dice and tables, encourages his friends to forget the royal "majesty, and is delighted when they freely express the passions, "which are excited by the incidents of play. At this game, which he "loves as the image of war, he alternately displays his eagerness, his "skill, his patience, and his cheerful temper. If he loses, he laughs; "he is modest and silent, if he wins. Yet, notwithstanding this "seeming indifference, his courtiers chuse to solicit any favour in the "moments of victory; and I myself, in my applications to the king, "have derived some benefit from my losses.[2] About the ninth hour "(three o'clock) the tide of business again returns, and flows incess- "antly till after sun-set, when the signal of the royal supper dismisses "the weary crowd of suppliants and pleaders. At the supper, a more

[1] Videas ibi elegantiam Græcam, abundantiam Gallicanam; celeritatem Italam; publicam pompam, privatam diligentiam, regiam disciplinam.

[2] Tunc etiam ego aliquid obsecraturus feliciter vincor, et mihi tabula perit ut causa salvetur. Sidonius of Auvergne was not a subject of Theodoric; but he might be compelled to solicit either justice or favour at the court of Thoulouse.

"familiar repast, buffoons and pantomimes are sometimes introduced, "to divert, not to offend, the company, by their ridiculous wit: but "female singers, and the soft effeminate modes of music, are severely "banished, and such martial tunes as animate the soul to deeds of "valour are alone grateful to the ear of Theodoric. He retires from "table; and the nocturnal guards are immediately posted at the "entrance of the treasury, the palace, and the private apartments."

When the king of the Visigoths encouraged Avitus to assume the purple, he offered his person and his forces, as a faithful soldier of the republic.[1] The exploits (A. D. 456) of Theodoric soon convinced the world, that he had not degenerated from the warlike virtues of his ancestors. After the establishment of the Goths in Aquitain, and the passage of the Vandals into Africa, the Suevi, who had fixed their kingdom in Gallicia, aspired to the conquest of Spain, and threatened to extinguish the feeble remains of the Roman dominion. The provincials of Carthagena and Tarragona, afflicted by an hostile invasion, represented their injuries and their apprehensions. Count Fronto was dispatched, in the name of the emperor Avitus, with advantageous offers of peace and alliance; and Theodoric interposed his weighty mediation, to declare, that, unless his brother-in-law, the king of the Suevi, immediately retired, he should be obliged to arm in the cause of justice and of Rome. "Tell him," replied the haughty Rechiarius, "that I despise his friendship and his arms; but that I shall soon try, "whether he will dare to expect my arrival under the walls of Thou-"louse." Such a challenge urged Theodoric to prevent the bold designs of his enemy: he passed the Pyrenees at the head of the Visigoths: the Franks and Burgundians served under his standard; and though he professed himself the dutiful servant of Avitus, he privately stipulated, for himself and his successors, the absolute possession of his Spanish conquests. The two armies, or rather the two nations, encountered each other on the banks of the river Urbicus, about twelve miles from Astorga; and the decisive victory of the Goths appeared for a while to have extirpated the name and kingdom of the Suevi. From the field of battle Theodoric advanced to Braga, their metropolis, which still retained the splendid vestiges of its ancient commerce and dignity.[2] His entrance was not polluted with blood, and the Goths respected the chastity of their female captives, more especially of the consecrated virgins: but the greatest part of the clergy and people were made slaves, and even the churches and altars were confounded in the universal pillage. The unfortunate king of the Suevi had escaped to one of the ports of the ocean; but the obstinacy of the winds opposed his flight; he was delivered to his implacable rival; and Rechiarius, who neither desired nor expected mercy, re-

[1] Theodoric himself had given a solemn and voluntary promise of fidelity, which was understood both in Gaul and Spain.

——— Romæ sum, te duce, Amicus, Principe te, MILES.
Sidon. Panegyr. Avit. 511.

[2] Quæque sinû pelagi jactat se Bracara dives.
Auson. de Claris Urbibus, p. 245.

From the design of the king of the Suevi, it is evident that the navigation from the ports of Gallicia to the Mediterranean was known and practised. The ships of Bracara, or Braga, cautiously steered along the coast, without daring to lose themselves in the Atlantic.

ceived, with manly constancy, the death which he would probably have inflicted. After this bloody sacrifice to policy or resentment, Theodoric carried his victorious arms as far as Merida, the principal town of Lusitania, without meeting any resistance, except from the miraculous powers of St. Eulalia; but he was stopped in the full career of success, and recalled from Spain, before he could provide for the security of his conquests. In his retreat towards the Pyrenees, he revenged his disappointment on the country through which he passed, and in the sack of Pollentia and Astorga, he showed himself a faithless ally, as well as a cruel enemy. Whilst the king of the Visigoths fought and vanquished in the name of Avitus, the reign of Avitus had expired; and both the honour and the interest of Theodoric were deeply wounded by the disgrace of a friend, whom he had seated on the throne of the Western empire.[1]

The pressing solicitations of the senate and people, persuaded the emperor Avitus to fix his residence at Rome, and to accept the consulship for the ensuing year. On the first day of January, his son-in-law, Sidonius Apollinaris, celebrated his praises in a panegyric of six hundred verses; but this composition, though it was rewarded with a brass statue,[2] seems to contain a very moderate proportion, either of genius or of truth. The poet, if may we degrade that sacred name, exaggerates the merit of a sovereign and a father; and his prophecy of a long and glorious reign was soon contradicted by the event. Avitus, at a time when the Imperial dignity was reduced to a pre-eminence of toil and danger, indulged himself in the pleasures of Italian luxury. The Romans were not inclined, either to excuse his faults, or to acknowledge his virtues. The several parts of the empire became every day more alienated from each other; and the stranger of Gaul was the object of popular hatred and contempt. The senate asserted their legitimate claim in the election of an emperor; and their authority, which had been originally derived from the old constitution, was again fortified by the actual weakness of a declining monarchy. Yet even such a monarchy might have resisted the votes of an unarmed senate, if their discontent had not been supported, or perhaps inflamed, by Count Ricimer, one of the principal commanders of the Barbarian troops, who formed the military defence of Italy. The daughter of Wallia, king of the Visigoths, was the mother of Ricimer; but he was descended, on the father's side, from the nation of the Suevi:[3] his pride, or patriotism, might be exasperated by the misfortunes of his countrymen; and he obeyed, with reluctance, an emperor, in whose elevation he had not been consulted. His faithful and important services against the common enemy, rendered him still more formidable;[4] and, after destroying, on the coast of Corsica, a fleet of Vandals, which consisted of sixty gallies, Ricimer returned in triumph

[1] This Suevic war is the most authentic part of the Chronicle of Idatius, who, as bishop of Iria Flavia, was himself a spectator and a sufferer. Jornan. (c. 44. p. 675.) has expatiated, with pleasure, on the Gothic victory.

[2] In one of the porticoes or galleries belonging to Trajan's library; among the statues of famous writers and orators. Sidon. Apoll. l. ix. epist. 16. p. 284. Carm. viii. 350.

[3] Sidonius (Panegyr. Anthem. 302.) praises the royal birth of Ricimer, the lawful heir, as he chuses to insinuate, both of the Gothic and Suevic kingdoms.

[4] Chron. of Idatius. Jornan. (c. 44. p. 676.) styles him, with some truth virum egregium, et pene tunc in Italiâ ad exercitum singularem.

with the appellation of the deliverer of Italy. He chose that moment to signify to Avitus, that his reign was at an end; and the feeble emperor, at a distance from his Gothic allies, was compelled, after a short and unavailing struggle, to abdicate the purple. By the clemency, however, or the contempt, of Ricimer,[1] he was permitted to descend from the throne, to the more desirable station of bishop of Placentia: but the resentment of the senate was still unsatisfied; and their inflexible severity pronounced the sentence of his death. He fled towards the Alps, with the humble hope, not of arming the Visigoths in his cause, but of securing his person and treasures in the sanctuary of Julian, one of the tutelar saints of Auvergne.[2] Disease, or the hand of the executioner, arrested him (A. D. 456. Oct. 16) on the road; yet his remains were decently transported to Brivas, or Brioude, in his native province, and he reposed at the feet of his holy patron.[3] Avitus left only one daughter, the wife of Sidonius Apollinaris, who inherited the patrimony of his father-in-law; lamenting, at the same time, the disappointment of his public and private expectations. His resentment prompted him to join, or at least to countenance, the measures of a rebellious faction in Gaul; and the poet had contracted some guilt, which it was incumbent on him to expiate, by a new tribute of flattery to the succeeding emperor.[4]

The successor (A.D. 457) of Avitus presents the welcome discovery of a great and heroic character, such as sometimes arise in a degenerate age, to vindicate the honour of the human species. The emperor Majorian has deserved the praises of his contemporaries, and of posterity; and these praises may be strongly expressed in the words of a judicious and disinterested historian: "That he was gentle to his "subjects; that he was terrible to his enemies; and that he excelled "in *every* virtue, *all* his predecessors who had reigned over the Romans."[5] Such a testimony may justify at least the panegyric of Sidonius; and we may acquiesce in the assurance, that, although the obsequious orator would have flattered, with equal zeal, the most worthless of princes, the extraordinary merit of his object confined

[1] Parcens innocentiæ Aviti, is the compassionate, but contemptuous, language of Victor Tunnunensis (in Chron. apud Scaliger Euseb.). In another place, he calls him, vir totius simplicitatis. This commendation is more humble, but it is more solid and sincere, than the praises of Sidonius.

[2] He suffered, as it is supposed, in the persecution of Diocletian (Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. v. 279. 696.). Greg. of Tours, his peculiar votary, has dedicated, to the glory of Julian the Martyr, an entire book (de Gloriâ Martyrum, l. ii. in Max. Bibliot. Patrum, xi. 861.), in which he relates about fifty foolish miracles performed by his relics.

[3] Greg. of Tours (l. ii. c. xi. 168.) is concise, but correct, in the reign of his countryman. The words of Idatius, "caret imperio, caret et vitâ," seem to imply, that the death of Avitus was violent; but it must have been secret, since Evag. (l. ii. c. 7.) could suppose, that he died of the plague.

[4] After a modest appeal to the examples of his brethren, Virgil and Horace, Sidonius honestly confesses the debt, and promises payment.

Sic mihi diverso nuper sub Marte cadenti
Jussisti placido Victor ut essem animo.
Serviat ergo tibi servati lingua poetæ,
Atque meæ vitæ laus tua sit pretium.
Sidon. Apoll. carm. iv. 308.

See Dubos, Hist. Crit. i. 448.

[5] The words of Procopius deserve to be transcribed; *ουτος γαρ ο Μαιοριvος ξυμπαντας τους πωποτε Ρωμαιων βεβασιλευκοτας υπεραιρων αρετη παση*; and afterwards, *ανηρ τα μεν εις τους υπηκοους μετριος γεγονως, φοβερος δε τα ες τους πολεμιους* (de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 7. p. 194.); a concise but comprehensive definition of royal virtue.

him, on this occasion, within the bounds of truth.[1] Majorian derived his name from his maternal grandfather, who, in the reign of the great Theodosius, had commanded the troops of the Illyrian frontier. He gave his daughter in marriage to the father of Majorian, a respectable officer, who administered the revenues of Gaul with skill and integrity; and generously preferred the friendship of Ætius, to the tempting offers of an insidious court. His son, the future emperor, who was educated in the profession of arms, displayed, from his early youth, intrepid courage, premature wisdom, and unbounded liberality in a scanty fortune. He followed the standard of Ætius, contributed to his success, shared, and sometimes eclipsed, his glory, and at last excited the jealousy of the patrician, or rather of his wife, who forced him to retire from the service.[2] Majorian, after the death of Ætius, was recalled, and promoted; and his intimate connexion with count Ricimer, was the immediate step by which he ascended the throne of the Western empire. During the vacancy that succeeded the abdication of Avitus, the ambitious Barbarian, whose birth excluded him from the Imperial dignity, governed Italy, with the title of Patrician; resigned, to his friend, the conspicuous station of master-general of the cavalry and infantry; and, after an interval of some months, consented to the unanimous wish of the Romans, whose favour Majorian had solicited by a recent victory over the Alemanni.[3] He was invested with the purple at Ravenna; and the epistle which he addressed to the senate, will best describe his situation and his sentiments. "Your election, Con-"script Fathers, and the ordinance of the most valiant army, have "made me your emperor.[4] May the propitious Deity direct and prosper "the counsels and events of my administration, to your advantage, "and to the public welfare! For my own part, I did not aspire, I have "submitted, to reign; nor should I have discharged the obligations of "a citizen, if I had refused, with base and selfish ingratitude, to sup-"port the weight of those labours, which were imposed by the repub-"lic. Assist, therefore, the prince whom you have made; partake the "duties which you have enjoined; and may our common endeavours "promote the happiness of an empire, which I have accepted from "your hands. Be assured, that, in our times, justice shall resume her

[1] The Panegyric was pronounced at Lyons before the end of the year 458, while the emperor was still consul. It has more art than genius, and more labour than art. The ornaments are false or trivial; the expression is feeble and prolix: and Sidonius wants the skill to exhibit the principal figure in a strong and distinct light. The private life of Majorian occupies about two hundred lines, 107—305.

[2] She pressed his immediate death, and was scarcely satisfied with his disgrace. It should seem, that Ætius, like Belisarius and Marlborough, was governed by his wife.

[3] The Alemanni had passed the Rhætian Alps, and were defeated in the *Campi Canini*, or Valley of Bellinzone, through which the Tesin flows, in its descent from Mount Adula, to the Lago Maggiore (Cluver. Italia Antiq. i. p. 100.). This boasted victory over *nine hundred* Barbarians (Paneg. Majori. 373.) betrays the extreme weakness of Italy.

[4] Imperatorem me factum, P. C. electionis vestræ arbitrio, et fortissimi exercitus ordinatione agnoscite (Novell. Majorian. tit. iii. p. 34. ad Calcem Cod. Theodos.). Sidonius proclaims the unanimous voice of the empire.

———— Postquam ordine vobis
Ordo omnis regnum dederat; *plebs, curia, miles,*
Et *collega* simul. ———— 386.

This language is ancient and constitutional; and we may observe that the *clergy* were not yet considered as a distinct order of the state.

"ancient vigour, and that virtue shall become not only innocent but "meritorious. Let none, except the authors themselves, be apprehens- "ive of *delations*,[1] which, as a subject, I have always condemned, and, "as a prince, will severely punish. Our own vigilance, and that of our "father, the patrician Ricimer, shall regulate all military affairs, and "provide for the safety of the Roman world, which we have saved from "foreign and domestic enemies.[2] You now understand the maxims of "my government: you may confide in the faithful love and sincere as- "surances of a prince, who has formerly been the companion of your "life and dangers; who still glories in the name of senator, and who "is anxious, that you should never repent of the judgment which you "have pronounced in his favour." The emperor, who, amidst the ruins of the Roman world, revived the ancient language of law and liberty, which Trajan would not have disclaimed, must have derived those generous sentiments from his own heart; since they were not suggested to his imitation by the customs of his age, or the example of his predecessors.[3]

The private and public actions (A.D. 457—461) of Majorian are very imperfectly known; but his laws, remarkable for an original cast of thought and expression, faithfully represent the character of a sovereign, who loved his people, who sympathized in their distress, who had studied the causes of the decline of the empire, and who was capable of applying (as far as such reformation was practicable) judicious and effectual remedies to the public disorders.[4] His regulations concerning the finances manifestly tended to remove, or at least to mitigate, the most intolerable grievances. I. From the first hour of his reign, he was solicitous (I translate his own words) to relieve the *weary* fortunes of the provincials, oppressed by the accumulated weight of indictions and superindictions.[5] With this view, he granted an universal amnesty, a final and absolute discharge of all arrears of tribute, of all debts, which, under any pretence, the fiscal officers might demand from the people. This wise dereliction of obsolete, vexatious, and unprofitable claims, improved and purified the sources of the public revenue; and the subject who could now look back without despair, might labour with hope and gratitude for himself and for his country. II. In the assessment and collection of taxes Majorian restored the ordinary jurisdiction of the provincial magistrates; and suppressed the extraordinary commissions which had been introduced, in the name of the emperor himself, or of the Prætorian præfects. The favourite servants, who obtained such irregular powers, were

[1] Either dilationes, or dilationes, would afford a tolerable reading; but there is much more sense and spirit in the latter, to which I have therefore given the preference.

[2] Ab externo hoste et a domesticâ clade liberavimus: by the latter, Majorian must understand the tyranny of Avitus; whose death he consequently avowed as a meritorious act. On this occasion, Sidonius is fearful and obscure; he describes the twelve Cæsars, the nations of Africa, &c. that he may escape the dangerous name of Avitus (305.).

[3] See the whole edict or epistle of Majorian to the senate (Novell. tit. iv. 34.). Yet the expression, *regnum nostrum*, bears some taint of the age, and does not mix kindly with the word *respublica*, which he frequently repeats.

[4] See the laws of Majorian (they are only nine in number, but very long and various), at the end of Theod. Code, Novell. l. iv. 32. Godefroy has not given any commentary on these additional pieces.

[5] Fessas provincialium variâ atque multiplici tributorum exactione fortunas, et extraordinariis fiscalium solutionum oneribus attritas, &c. Novell. Majorian. tit. iv. 34.

insolent in their behaviour, and arbitrary in their demands: they affected to despise the subordinate tribunals, and they were discontented, if their fees and profits did not twice exceed the sum which they condescended to pay into the treasury. One instance of their extortion would appear incredible, were it not authenticated by the legislator himself. They exacted the whole payment in gold: but they refused the current coin of the empire, and would accept only such ancient pieces as were stamped with the names of Faustina or the Antonines. The subject, who was unprovided with these curious medals, had recourse to the expedient of compounding with their rapacious demands; or if he succeeded in the research, his imposition was doubled, according to the weight and value of the money of former times.[1] III. "The municipal corporations (says the emperor), the "lesser senates (so antiquity has justly styled them), deserve to be "considered as the heart of the cities, and the sinews of the republic. "And yet so low are they now reduced, by the injustice of magistrates, "and the venality of collectors, that many of their members, renouncing "their dignity and their country, have taken refuge in distant and "obscure exile." He urges, and even compels, their return to their respective cities; but he removes the grievance which had forced them to desert the exercise of their municipal functions. They are directed, under the authority of the provincial magistrates, to resume their office of levying the tribute; but instead of being made responsible for the whole sum assessed on their district, they are only required to produce a regular account of the payments which they have actually received, and of the defaulters who are still indebted to the public. IV. But Majorian was not ignorant that these corporate bodies were too much inclined to retaliate the injustice and oppression which they had suffered; and he therefore revives the useful office of the *defenders of cities.* He exhorts the people to elect, in a full and free assembly, some man of discretion and integrity, who would dare to assert their privileges, to represent their grievances, to protect the poor from the tyranny of the rich, and to inform the emperor of the abuses that were committed under the sanction of his name and authority.

The spectator who casts a mournful view over the ruins of ancient Rome, is tempted to accuse the memory of the Goths and Vandals, for the mischief which they had neither leisure, nor power, nor perhaps inclination, to perpetrate. The tempest of war might strike some lofty turrets to the ground; but the destruction which undermined the foundations of those massy fabrics, was prosecuted, slowly and silently, during a period of ten centuries; and the motives of interest, that afterwards operated without shame or control, were severely checked by the taste and spirit of the emperor Majorian. The decay of the city had gradually impaired the value of the public works. The circus and theatres might still excite, but they seldom gratified, the desires of the people: the temples, which had escaped the zeal of the Christians, were no longer inhabited either by gods or men; the diminished

[1] The learned Greaves (vol. i. 329.) has found, by a diligent inquiry, that *aurei* of the Antonines weighed 118, and those of the fifth century only 68, English grains. Majorian gives currency to all gold coin, excepting only the *Gallic solidus*, from its deficiency, not in the weight, but in the standard.

crowds of the Romans were lost in the immense space of their baths and porticoes; and the stately libraries and halls of justice became useless to an indolent generation, whose repose was seldom disturbed, either by study, or business. The monuments of consular, or Imperial, greatness were no longer revered, as the immortal glory of the capital; they were only esteemed as an inexhaustible mine of materials, cheaper, and more convenient, than the distant quarry. Specious petitions were continually addressed to the easy magistrates of Rome, which stated the want of stones or bricks for some necessary service: the fairest forms of architecture were rudely defaced for the sake of some paltry, or pretended, repairs; and the degenerate Romans, who converted the spoil to their own emolument, demolished, with sacrilegious hands, the labours of their ancestors. Majorian, who had often sighed over the desolation of the city, applied a severe remedy to the growing evil.[1] He reserved to the prince and senate the sole cognisance of the extreme cases which might justify the destruction of an ancient edifice; imposed a fine of fifty pounds of gold (£2000), on every magistrate, who should presume to grant such illegal and scandalous licence; and threatened to chastise the criminal obedience of their subordinate officers, by a severe whipping, and the amputation of both their hands. In the last instance, the legislator might seem to forget the proportion of guilt and punishment; but his zeal arose from a generous principle, and Majorian was anxious to protect the monuments of those ages, in which he would have desired and deserved to live. The emperor conceived, that it was his interest to increase the number of his subjects; that it was his duty to guard the purity of the marriage-bed; but the means which he employed to accomplish these salutary purposes, are of an ambiguous, and perhaps exceptionable, kind. Nuns were restrained from taking the veil, till they had reached their fortieth year. Widows under that age were compelled to form a second alliance within the term of five years, by the forfeiture of half their wealth to their nearest relations, or to the state. Unequal marriages were condemned or annulled. The punishment of confiscation and exile was deemed so inadequate to the guilt of adultery, that, if the criminal returned to Italy, he might, by the express declaration of Majorian, be slain with impunity.[2]

While the emperor Majorian assiduously laboured to restore the happiness and virtue of the Romans, he encountered the arms of Genseric, from his character and situation, their most formidable enemy. A fleet of Vandals and Moors landed at the mouth of the Liris, or Garigliano: but the Imperial troops surprised and attacked the disorderly Barbarians, who were encumbered with the spoils of

[1] The whole edict (Novell. Majorian, tit. vi. p. 35.) is curious. "Antiquarum ædium dissipatur speciosa constructio; et ut aliquid reparetur, magna diruuntur. Hinc jam occasio "nascitur, ut etiam unusquisque privatum ædificium construens, per gratiam judicum. . . . "præsumere de publicis locis necessaria, et transferre non dubitet," &c. With equal zeal, but with less power, Petrarch, in the fourteenth century, repeated the same complaints (Vie de Petrarque, i. 326.). If I prosecute this History, I shall not be unmindful of the decline and fall of the *city* of Rome; an interesting object, to which my plan was originally confined.

[2] The emperor chides the lenity of Rogatian, consular of Tuscany, in a style of acrimonious reproof, which sounds almost like personal resentment (Novell. tit. ix. 37.). The law of Majorian, which punished obstinate widows, was soon afterwards repealed by his successor Severus (Novell. Sever. tit. i. 37.).

Campania; they were chased with slaughter to their ships, and their leader, the king's brother-in-law, was found in the number of the slain. —*Sidon. Paneg. Majorian.* 385. Such vigilance might announce the character of the new reign; but the strictest vigilance, and the most numerous forces, were insufficient to protect the long-extended coast of Italy from the depredations of a naval war. The public opinion had imposed a nobler and more arduous task on the genius of Majorian. Rome expected from him alone the restitution of Africa; and the design, which he formed, of attacking the Vandals in their new settlements, was the result of bold and judicious policy (A.D. 457). If the intrepid emperor could have infused his own spirit into the youth of Italy; if he could have revived, in the field of Mars, the manly exercises in which he had always surpassed his equals; he might have marched against Genseric at the head of a *Roman* army. Such a reformation of national manners might be embraced by the rising generation; but it is the misfortune of those princes who laboriously sustain a declining monarchy, that, to obtain some immediate advantage, or to avert some impending danger, they are forced to countenance, and even to multiply, the most pernicious abuses. Majorian, like the weakest of his predecessors, was reduced to the disgraceful expedient of substituting Barbarian auxiliaries in the place of his unwarlike subjects: and his superior abilities could only be displayed in the vigour and dexterity with which he wielded a dangerous instrument, so apt to recoil on the hand that used it. Besides the confederates, who were already engaged in the service of the empire, the fame of his liberality and valour attracted the nations of the Danube, the Borysthenes, and perhaps of the Tanais. Many thousands of the bravest subjects of Attila, the Gepidæ, the Ostrogoths, the Rugians, the Burgundians, the Suevi, the Alani, assembled in the plains of Liguria; and their formidable strength was balanced by their mutual animosities.[1] They passed the Alps in a severe winter. The emperor led the way, on foot, and in complete armour; sounding, with his long staff, the depth of the ice, or snow, and encouraging the Scythians, who complained of the extreme cold, by the cheerful assurance, that they should be satisfied with the heat of Africa. The citizens of Lyons had presumed to shut their gates: they soon implored, and experienced, the clemency of Majorian. He vanquished Theodoric in the field; and admitted to his friendship and alliance, a king whom he had found not unworthy of his arms. The beneficial, though precarious, reunion of the greatest part of Gaul and Spain, was the effect of persuasion, as well as of force;[2] and the independent Bagaudæ, who had escaped, or resisted, the oppression of former reigns, were disposed to confide in the virtues of Majorian. His camp was filled with Barbarian allies; his throne was supported by the zeal of an affectionate people; but the emperor had foreseen, that it was impossible, without

[1] The review of the army, and passage of the Alps, contain the most tolerable passages of the Panegyric (470—552.). De Buat (Hist. des Peup. viii. 49.) is a more satisfactory commentator, than either Savaron or Sirmond.

[2] Τα μεν οπλοις, τα δε λογοις, is the just and forcible distinction of Priscus (Excerpt. Legat. p. 42.) in a short fragment, which throws much light on the history of Majorian. Jornandes has suppressed the defeat and alliance of the Visigoths, which were solemnly proclaimed in Gallicia; and are marked in the Chronicle of Idatius.

a maritime power, to achieve the conquest of Africa. In the first Punic war, the republic had exerted such incredible diligence, that, within sixty days after the first stroke of the axe had been given in the forest, a fleet of 160 gallies proudly rode at anchor in the sea.[1] Under circumstances much less favourable, Majorian equalled the spirit and perseverance of the ancient Romans. The woods of the Apennine were felled; the arsenals and manufactures of Ravenna and Misenum were restored; Italy and Gaul vied with each other in liberal contributions to the public service; and the Imperial navy of 300 large gallies, with an adequate proportion of transports and smaller vessels, was collected in the secure and capacious harbour of Carthagena in Spain.[2] The intrepid countenance of Majorian animated his troops with a confidence of victory; and if we might credit the historian Procopius, his courage sometimes hurried him beyond the bounds of prudence. Anxious to explore, with his own eyes, the state of the Vandals, he ventured, after disguising the colour of his hair, to visit Carthage, in the character of his own ambassador: and Genseric was afterwards mortified by the discovery, that he had entertained and dismissed the emperor of the Romans. Such an anecdote may be rejected as an improbable fiction; but it is a fiction which would not have been imagined, unless in the life of a hero.[3]

Without the help of a personal interview, Genseric was sufficiently acquainted with the genius and designs of his adversary. He practised his customary arts of fraud and delay, but he practised them without success. His applications for peace became each hour more submissive, and perhaps more sincere; but the inflexible Majorian had adopted the ancient maxim, that Rome could not be safe, as long as Carthage existed in a hostile state. The king of the Vandals distrusted the valour of his native subjects, who were enervated by the luxury of the South;[4] he suspected the fidelity of the vanquished people, who abhorred him as an Arian tyrant; and the desperate measure, which he executed, of reducing Mauritania into a desert,[5] could not defeat the operations of the Roman emperor, who was at liberty to land his troops on any part of the African coast. But Genseric was saved from impending and inevitable ruin, by the treachery of some powerful subjects; envious, or apprehensive, of

[1] Florus, l. ii. c. 2. He amuses himself with the poetical fancy, that the trees had been transformed into ships: and indeed the whole transaction, as it is related in the first book of Polybius, deviates too much from the probable course of human events.

[2] Interea duplici texis dum littore classem
Inferno superoque mari, cedit omnis in æquor
Sylva tibi, &c.———— Sidon. Paneg. Majorian. 441.

The number of ships, which Priscus fixes at 300, is magnified, by an indefinite comparison with the fleets of Agamemnon, Xerxes, and Augustus.

[3] Procop. de Bell. Vand. l. i. c. 8. p. 194. When Genseric conducted his unknown guest into the arsenal of Carthage, the arms clashed of their own accord. Majorian had tinged his yellow locks with a black colour.

[4] ——— Spoliisque potitus
Immensis, robur luxû jam perdidit omne,
Quo valuit dum pauper erat.
Paneg. Majorian. 330.

He afterwards applies to Genseric, unjustly as it should seem, the vices of his subjects.

[5] He burnt the villages, and poisoned the springs. (Priscus, p. 42.) Dubos (Hist. Crit. i. 475.) observes, that the magazines which the Moors buried in the earth, might escape his destructive search. Two or three hundred pits are sometimes dug in the same place; and each pit contains at least 400 bushels of corn. Shaw's Travels, p. 139.

their master's success. Guided by their secret intelligence, he surprised the unguarded fleet in the bay of Cartnagena: many of the ships were sunk, or taken, or burnt; and the preparations of three years were destroyed in a single day.[1] After this event, the behaviour of the two antagonists showed them superior to their fortune. The Vandal, instead of being elated by this accidental victory, immediately renewed his solicitations for peace. The emperor of the West, who was capable of forming great designs, and of supporting heavy disappointments, consented to a treaty, or rather to a suspension of arms; in the full assurance that, before he could restore his navy, he should be supplied with provocations to justify a second war. Majorian returned to Italy, to prosecute his labours for the public happiness; and, as he was conscious of his own integrity, he might long remain ignorant of the dark conspiracy which threatened his throne and his life. The recent misfortune of Carthagena sullied the glory which had dazzled the eyes of the multitude: almost every description of civil and military officers were exasperated against the Reformer, since they all derived some advantage from the abuses which he endeavoured to suppress; and the patrician Ricimer impelled the inconstant passions of the Barbarians against a prince whom he esteemed and hated. The virtues of Majorian could not protect him from the impetuous sedition, which broke out in the camp near Tortona, at the foot of the Alps. He was compelled to abdicate the Imperial purple: five days after his abdication, it was reported that he died (A.D. 461. Aug. 7) of a dysentery;[2] and the humble tomb, which covered his remains, was consecrated by the respect and gratitude of succeeding generations.[3] The private character of Majorian inspired love and respect. Malicious calumny and satire excited his indignation, or, if he himself were the object, his contempt: but he protected the freedom of wit, and in the hours which the emperor gave to the familiar society of his friends, he could indulge his taste for pleasantry, without degrading the majesty of his rank.[4]

It was not perhaps without some regret, that Ricimer sacrificed his friend to the interest of his ambition: but he resolved, in a second choice, to avoid the imprudent preference of superior virtue and merit. At his command, the obsequious senate of Rome bestowed the Imperial title on Libius Severus, who ascended the throne (A.D. 461—467) of the West without emerging from the obscurity of a private condition. History has scarcely deigned to notice his birth, his eleva-

[1] Idatius, who was safe in Gallicia from the power of Ricimer, boldly and honestly declares, Vandali per proditores admoniti, &c. he dissembles, however, the name of the traitor.

[2] Procop. de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 8. p. 194. The testimony of Idatius is fair and impartial; "Majorianum de Galliis Romam redeuntem, et Romano imperio vel nomini res necessarias "ordinantem; Richimer livore percitus, et *invidorum* consilio fultus, fraude interficit circum-"ventum." Some read *Suevorum*, and I am unwilling to efface either of the words, as they express the different accomplices who united in the conspiracy against Majorian.

[3] Epigrams of Ennodius, No. cxxxv, inter Sirmond Opera, tom. i. 1903. It is flat and obscure; but Ennodius was made bishop of Pavia fifty years after the death of Majorian, and his praise deserves credit and regard.

[4] Sidonius gives a tedious account (l. i. epist. xi. 25.) of a supper at Arles, to which he was invited by Majorian, a short time before his death. He had no intention of praising a deceased emperor; but a casual disinterested remark, "Subrisit Augustus; ut erat, auctoritate servatâ, cum se communioni dedisset, joci plenus," outweighs the 600 lines of his venal panegyric.

tion, his character, or his death. Severus expired, as soon as his life became inconvenient to his patron;[1] and it would be useless to discriminate his nominal reign in the vacant interval of six years (A.D. 462—467) between the death of Majorian and the elevation of Anthemius. During that period the government was in the hands of Ricimer alone; and athough the modest Barbarian disclaimed the name of ing, he accumulated treasures, formed a separate army, negociated private alliances, and ruled Italy with the same independent and despotic authority, which was afterwards exercised by Odoacer and Theodoric. But his dominions were bounded by the Alps; and two Roman generals, Marcellinus and Ægidius, maintained their allegiance to the republic, by rejecting, with disdain, the phantom which he styled an emperor. Marcellinus still adhered to the old religion; and the devout Pagans, who secretly disobeyed the laws of the church and state, applauded his profound skill in the science of divination. But he possessed the more valuable qualifications of learning, virtue, and courage:[2] the study of the Latin literature had improved his taste; and his military talents had recommended him to the esteem and confidence of the great Ætius, in whose ruin he was involved. By a timely flight, Marcellinus escaped the rage of Valentinian, and boldly asserted his liberty amidst the convulsions of the Western empire. His voluntary, or reluctant, submission to the authority of Majorian, was rewarded by the government of Sicily, and the command of an army, stationed in that island to oppose, or to attack, the Vandals; but his Barbarian mercenaries, after the emperor's death, were tempted to revolt by the artful liberality of Ricimer. At the head of a band of faithful followers, the intrepid Marcellinus occupied the province of Dalmatia, assumed the title of patrician of the West, secured the love of his subjects by a mild and equitable reign, built a fleet, which claimed the dominion of the Hadriatic, and alternately alarmed the coasts of Italy and of Africa.[3] Ægidius, the master-general of Gaul, who equalled, or at least who imitated, the heroes of ancient Rome,[4] proclaimed his immortal resentment against the assassins of his beloved master. A brave and numerous army was attached to his standard; and, though he was prevented by the arts of Ricimer, and the arms of the Visigoths, from marching to the gates of Rome, he maintained his independent sovereignty beyond the Alps, and rendered the name of Ægidius respectable both in peace and war. The Franks, who had punished with exile the youthful follies of Childeric, elected the Roman general for their king; his vanity, rather than his ambition, was gratified by that singular honour; and when the nation, at the end of four

[1] Sidon. (Paneg. Anthem. 317.) dismisses him to heaven.

Auxérat Augustus naturæ lege Severus Divorum numerum.———

And an old list of the emperors, composed about the time of Justinian, praises his piety, and fixes his residence at Rome (Sirmond Not. ad Sidon. p. 111.).

[2] Tillemont, who is always scandalized by the virtues of Infidels, attributes this advantageous portrait of Marcellinus (which Suidas has preserved) to the partial zeal of some Pagan historian (Hist. des Emp. vi. 330.).

[3] Procop. de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 6. p. 191. In various circumstances of the life of Marcellinus, it is not easy to reconcile the Greek historian with the Latin Chronicles of his times.

[4] I must apply to Ægidius the praises which Sidonius (Paneg. Majori. 553.) bestows on a nameless master-general, who commanded the rear-guard of Majorian. Idatius, from public report, commends his Christian piety; and Priscus mentions (p. 42.) his military virtues.

years, repented of the injury which they had offered to the Merovingian family, he patiently acquiesced in the restoration of the lawful prince. The authority of Ægidius ended only with his life; and the suspicions of poison and secret violence, which derived some countenance from the character of Ricimer, were eagerly entertained by the passionate credulity of the Gauls.[1]

The kingdom of Italy, a name to which the Western empire was gradually reduced, was afflicted, under the reign of Ricimer, by the incessant depredations of the Vandal pirates.[2] In the spring of each year (A.D. 461—467) they equipped a formidable navy in the port of Carthage; and Genseric himself, though in a very advanced age, still commanded in person the most important expeditions. His designs were concealed with impenetrable secrecy, till the moment that he hoisted sail. When he was asked by his pilot, what course he should steer; "Leave the determination to the winds (replied the Bar-"barian, with pious arrogance); *they* will transport us to the guilty "coast, whose inhabitants have provoked the divine justice:" but if Genseric himself deigned to issue more precise orders, he judged the most wealthy to be the most criminal. The Vandals repeatedly visited the coasts of Spain, Liguria, Tuscany, Campania, Lucania, Bruttium, Apulia, Calabria, Venetia, Dalmatia, Epirus, Greece, and Sicily: they were tempted to subdue the island of Sardinia, so advantageously placed in the centre of the Mediterranean; and their arms spread desolation, or terror, from the columns of Hercules to the mouth of the Nile. As they were more ambitious of spoil than of glory, they seldom attacked any fortified cities, or engaged any regular troops in the open field. But the celerity of their motions enabled them, almost at the same time, to threaten and to attack the most distant objects, which attracted their desires; and as they always embarked a sufficient number of horses, they had no sooner landed, than they swept the dismayed country with a body of light cavalry. Yet, notwithstanding the example of their king, the native Vandals and Alani insensibly declined this toilsome and perilous warfare; the hardy generation of the first conquerors was almost extinguished, and their sons, who were born in Africa, enjoyed the delicious baths and gardens which had been acquired by the valour of their fathers. Their place was readily supplied by a various multitude of Moors and Romans, of captives and outlaws; and those desperate wretches, who had already violated

[1] Greg. Turon. l. ii. c. 12. ii. 168. The Pere Daniel, whose ideas were superficial and modern, has started some objections against the story of Childeric (Hist. de France, i. Preface Hist. p. lxxviii. &c.): but they have been fairly satisfied by Dubos (Hist. Crit. i. 460.), and by two authors who disputed the prize of the Academy of Soissons (p. 131—177. 310—339.). With regard to the term of Childeric's exile, it is necessary either to prolong the life of Ægidius beyond the date assigned by the Chronicle of Idatius; or to correct the text of Gregory, by reading *quarto* anno, instead of *octavo*.

[2] The naval war of Genseric is described by Priscus (Excerp. Legat. p. 42.), Procop. (de Bell. Vandal. l. i. c. 5. p. 189, 190. and c. 22. p. 228.), Vict. Vitensis (de Persec. Vandal. l. i. c. 17., and Ruinart, p. 467.), and in the three panegyrics of Sidonius, whose chronological order is absurdly transposed in the editions both of Savaron and Sirmond. (Avit. Carm. vii. 441. Majori. Carm. v. 327. Anthem. Carm. ii. 348.) In one passage the poet seems inspired by his subject, and expresses a strong idea, by a lively image:

——— Hinc Vandalus hostis
Urget; et in nostrum numerosâ classe quotannis
Militat excidium; conversoque ordine Fati
Torrida Caucaseos infert mihi Byrsa furores.

the laws of their country, were the most eager to promote the atrocious acts which disgrace the victories of Genseric. In the treatment of his unhappy prisoners, he sometimes consulted his avarice, and sometimes indulged his cruelty; and the massacre of 500 noble citizens of Zant or Zacynthus, whose mangled bodies he cast into the Ionian sea, was imputed, by the public indignation, to his latest posterity.

Such crimes could not be excused by any provocations; but the war which the king of the Vandals prosecuted against the Roman empire, was justified by a specious and reasonable motive. The widow of Valentinian, Eudoxia, whom he had led captive from Rome to Carthage, was the sole heiress of the Theodosian house; her elder daughter, Eudocia, became the reluctant wife of Hunneric, his eldest son; and the stern father, asserting a legal claim, which could not easily be refuted or satisfied, demanded a just proportion of the Imperial patrimony. An adequate, or at least a valuable, compensation, was (A.D. 462, &c.) offered by the Eastern emperor, to purchase a necessary peace. Eudoxia and her younger daughter, Placidia, were honourably restored, and the fury of the Vandals was confined to the limits of the Western empire. The Italians, destitute of a naval force, which alone was capable of protecting their coasts, implored the aid of the more fortunate nations of the East; who had formerly acknowledged, in peace and war, the supremacy of Rome. But the perpetual division of the two empires had alienated their interest and their inclinations; the faith of a recent treaty was alleged; and the Western Romans, instead of arms and ships, could only obtain the assistance of a cold and ineffectual mediation. The haughty Ricimer, who had long struggled with the difficulties of his situation, was at length reduced to address the throne of Constantinople, in the humble language of a subject; and Italy submitted, as the price and security of the alliance, to accept a master from the choice of the emperor of the East.[1] It is not the purpose of the present chapter, or even of the present volume, to continue the distinct series of the Byzantine history; but a concise view of the reign and character of the emperor Leo, may explain the last efforts that were attempted to save the falling empire of the West.[2]

Since the death of the younger Theodosius, the domestic repose of Constantinople had never (A.D. 457—474) been interrupted by war or faction. Pulcheria had bestowed her hand, and the sceptre of the East, on the modest virtue of Marcian: he gratefully reverenced her august rank; and, after her death, he gave his people the example of the religious worship, that was due to the memory of the Imperial

[1] The poet himself is compelled to acknowledge the distress of Ricimer:

Præterea invictus Ricimer, quem publica fata
Respiciunt, *proprio* solus vix *Marte* repellit
Piratam per rura vagum———

Italy addresses her complaint to the Tyber, and Rome, at the solicitation of the river god, transports herself to Constantinople, renounces her ancient claims, and implores the friendship of Aurora, the goddess of the East. This fabulous machinery, which the genius of Claudian had used and abused, is the constant and miserable resource of the muse of Sidonius.

[2] The original authors of the reigns of Marcian, Leo, and Zeno, are reduced to some imperfect fragments, whose deficiencies must be supplied from the more recent compilations of Theophanes, Zonaras, and Cedrenus.

saint.[1] Attentive to the prosperity of his own dominions, Marcian seemed to behold, with indifference, the misfortunes of Rome; and the obstinate refusal of a brave and active prince to draw his sword against the Vandals, was ascribed to a secret promise, which had formerly been exacted from him when he was a captive in the power of Genseric.—*Procop. de Bell. Vandal.* l. i. c. 4. p. 185. The death of Marcian, after a reign of seven years, would have exposed the East to the danger of a popular election; if the superior weight of a single family had not been able to incline the balance in favour of the candidate whose interest they supported. The patrician Aspar might have placed the diadem on his own head, if he would have subscribed the Nicene creed.[2] During three generations, the armies of the East were successively commanded by his father, by himself, and by his son Ardaburius: his Barbarian guards formed a military force that overawed the palace and the capital; and the liberal distribution of his immense treasures, rendered Aspar as popular as he was powerful. He recommended the obscure name of Leo of Thrace, a military tribune, and the principal steward of his household. His nomination was unanimously ratified by the senate; and the servant of Aspar received the Imperial crown from the hands of the patriarch or bishop, who was permitted to express, by this unusual ceremony, the suffrage of the Deity.[3] This emperor, the first of the name of Leo, has been distinguished by the title of the *Great;* from a succession of princes, who gradually fixed, in the opinion of the Greeks, a very humble standard of heroic, or at least of royal, perfection. Yet the temperate firmness with which Leo resisted the oppression of his benefactor, showed that he was conscious of his duty and of his prerogative. Aspar was astonished to find that his influence could no longer appoint a præfect of Constantinople: he presumed to reproach his sovereign with a breach of promise, and insolently shaking his purple, "It is not proper (said he) that the man "who is invested with this garment, should be guilty of lying." "Nor "is it proper (replied Leo) that a prince should be compelled to resign "his own judgment, and the public interest, to the will of a subject."[4] After this extraordinary scene, it was impossible that the reconciliation of the emperor and the patrician could be sincere; or, at least, that it could be solid and permanent. An army of Isaurians[5] was secretly levied, and introduced into Constantinople; and while Leo undermined the authority and prepared the disgrace, of the family

[1] St. Pulcheria died A.D. 453, four years before her nominal husband; and her festival is celebrated on Sept. 10, by the modern Greeks: she bequeathed an immense patrimony to ecclesiastical uses. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xv. 181.

[2] From this disability of Aspar to ascend the throne, it may be inferred that the stain of *Heresy* was perpetual and indelible, while that of *Barbarism* disappeared in the second generation.

[3] Theophan. p. 95. This appears to be the first origin of a ceremony, which all the Christian princes of the world have since adopted; and from which the clergy have deduced the most formidable consequences.

[4] Cedren. (p. 345.), who was conversant with the writers of better days, has preserved the remarkable words of Aspar, *βασιλευ τον αυτην την αλουργιδα περιβεβλημενον ου χρη διαψευδεσθαι.*

[5] The power of the Isaurians agitated the Eastern empire in the two succeeding reigns of Zeno and Anastasius; but it ended in the destruction of those Barbarians, who maintained their fierce independence about 230 years.

of Aspar, his mild and cautious behaviour restrained them from any rash and desperate attempts which might have been fatal to themselves, or their enemies. The measures of peace and war were affected by this internal revolution. As long as Aspar degraded the majesty of the throne, the secret correspondence of religion and interest engaged him to favour the cause of Genseric. When Leo had delivered himself from that ignominious servitude, he listened to the complaints of the Italians; resolved to extirpate the tyranny of the Vandals; and declared his alliance with his colleague, Anthemius, whom he solemnly invested with the diadem and purple of the West.

The virtues of Anthemius (A.D. 467—472) have perhaps been magnified, since the Imperial descent, which he could only deduce from the usurper Procopius, has been swelled into a line of emperors.[1] But the merit of his immediate parents, their honours, and their riches, rendered Anthemius one of the most illustrious subjects of the East. His father Procopius obtained, after his Persian embassy, the rank of general and patrician; and the name of Anthemius was derived from his maternal grandfather, the celebrated præfect, who protected, with so much ability and success, the infant reign of Theodosius. The grandson of the præfect was raised above the condition of a private subject by his marriage with Euphemia, the daughter of the emperor Marcian. This splendid alliance, which might supersede the necessity of merit, hastened the promotion of Anthemius to the successive dignities of count, of master-general, of consul, and of patrician; and his merit or fortune claimed the honours of a victory, which was obtained on the banks of the Danube, over the Huns. Without indulging an extravagant ambition, the son-in-law of Marcian might hope to be his successor; but Anthemius supported the disappointment with courage and patience; and his subsequent elevation was universally approved by the public, who esteemed him worthy to reign, till he ascended the throne.[2] The emperor of the West marched from Constantinople, attended by several counts of high distinction, and a body of guards, almost equal to the strength and numbers of a regular army: he entered (A.D. 467, April 12) Rome in triumph, and the choice of Leo was confirmed by the senate, the people, and the Barbarian confederates of Italy.[3] The solemn inauguration of Anthemius was followed by the nuptials of his daughter and the patrician Ricimer; a fortunate event, which was considered as the firmest security of the union and happiness of the state. The wealth of two empires was ostentatiously displayed; and many senators completed their ruin by an expensive effort to disguise their poverty. All serious business was suspended during this festival; the courts of justice were shut; the streets of Rome, the theatres, the places of public and private

[1] ——— Tali tu civis ab urbe
Procopio genitore micas; cui prisca propago
Augustis venit a *proavis.*

The poet (Sidon. Paneg. Anthem. 67.) then proceeds to relate the private life and fortunes of the future emperor, with which he must have been very imperfectly acquainted.

[2] Sidonius discovers, with tolerable ingenuity, that this disappointment added new lustre to the virtues of Anthemius (210, &c.), who declined one sceptre and reluctantly accepted another (22, &c.).

[3] The poet again celebrates the unanimity of all orders of the state (15—22.): and the Chronicle of Idatius mentions the forces which attended his march.

resort, resounded with hymenæal songs and dances; and the royal bride, clothed in silken robes, with a crown on her head, was conducted to the palace of Ricimer, who had changed his military dress for the habit of a consul and a senator. On this memorable occasion, Sidonius, whose early ambition had been so fatally blasted, appeared as the orator of Auvergne, among the provincial deputies who addressed the throne with congratulations or complaints.[1] The calends of January (A.D. 468. Jan. 1) were now approaching, and the venal poet, who had loved Avitus, and esteemed Majorian, was persuaded, by his friends, to celebrate, in heroic verse, the merit, the felicity, the second consulship, and the future triumphs of the emperor Anthemius. Sidonius pronounced, with assurance and success, a panegyric which is still extant; and whatever might be the imperfections, either of the subject or of the composition, the welcome flatterer was immediately rewarded with the præfecture of Rome; a dignity which placed him among the illustrious personages of the empire, till he wisely preferred the more respectable character of a bishop and a saint.[2]

The Greeks ambitiously commend the piety and catholic faith of the emperor whom they gave to the West; nor do they forget to observe, that when he left Constantinople, he converted his palace into the pious foundation of a public bath, a church, and an hospital for old men.[3] Yet some suspicious appearances are found to sully the theological fame of Anthemius. From the conversation of Philotheus, a Macedonian sectary, he had imbibed the spirit of religious toleration; and the Heretics of Rome would have assembled with impunity, if the bold and vehement censure which pope Hilary pronounced in the church of St. Peter, had not obliged him to abjure the unpopular indulgence.[4] Even the Pagans, a feeble and obscure remnant, conceived some vain hopes from the indifference, or partiality, of Anthemius; and his singular friendship for the philosopher Severus, whom he promoted to the consulship, was ascribed to a secret project, of reviving the ancient worship of the Gods.[5] These idols were crumbled into dust: and the mythology which had once been the creed of nations, was so universally disbelieved, that it might be employed without scandal, or at least without suspicion, by Christian poets.[6] Yet

[1] Interveni autem nuptiis Patricii Ricimeris, cui filia perennis Augusti in spem publicæ securitatis copulabatur. The journey of Sidonius from Lyons, and the festival of Rome, are described with some spirit. L. i. epist. 5. p. 9—13. Epist. 9. p. 21.

[2] Sidon. (l. i. epist. 9. p. 23.) very fairly states his motive, his labour, and his reward. "Hic "ipse Panegyricus, si non judicium, certe eventum, boni operis, accepit." He was made bishop of Clermont, A.D. 471. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xvi. 750.

[3] The palace of Anthemius stood on the banks of the Propontis. In the ninth century, Alexius, the son-in-law of the emperor Theophilus, obtained a permission to purchase the ground; and ended his days in a monastery which he founded on that delightful spot. Ducange, Constantinopolis Christiana, p. 117.

[4] Papa Hilarus . . . apud beatum Petrum Apostolum, palam ne id fieret clarâ voce constrinxit, in tantum ut non ea facienda cum interpositione juramenti idem promitteret Imperator. Gelasius Epistol. ad Andronicum apud Baron. A.D. 467. No. 3. The cardinal observes, with some complacency, that it was much easier to plant heresies at Constantinople, than at Rome.

[5] Damascius, in the Life of the philosopher Isidore, apud Photium, p. 1049. Damascius, who lived under Justinian, composed another work, consisting of 570 præternatural stories of souls, dæmons, apparitions, the dotage of Platonic Paganism.

[6] In the poetical works of Sidonius, which he afterwards condemned (l. ix. epist. 16. p. 285.), the fabulous deities are the principal actors. If Jerom was scourged by the angels for only reading Virgil; the bishop of Clermont, for such a vile imitation, deserved an additional whipping from the Muses.

the vestiges of superstition were not absolutely obliterated, and the festival of the Lupercalia, whose origin had preceded the foundation of Rome, was still celebrated under the reign of Anthemius. The savage and simple rites were expressive of an early state of society before the invention of arts and agriculture. The rustic deities who presided over the toils and pleasures of the pastoral life, Pan, Faunus, and their train of satyrs, were such as the fancy of shepherds might create, sportive, petulant, and lascivious; whose power was limited, and whose malice was inoffensive. A goat was the offering the best adapted to their character and attributes; the flesh of the victim was roasted on willow spits; and the riotous youths, who crowded to the feast, ran about the fields, with leather thongs in their hands, communicating, as it was supposed, the blessing of fecundity to the women whom they touched.[1] The altar of Pan was erected, perhaps by Evander the Arcadian, in a dark recess in the side of the Palatine-hill, watered by a perpetual fountain, and shaded by a hanging grove. A tradition, that, in the same place, Romulus and Remus were suckled by the wolf, rendered it still more sacred and venerable in the eyes of the Romans; and this sylvan spot was gradually surrounded by the stately edifices of the Forum.[2] After the conversion of the Imperial city, the Christians still continued, in the month of February, the annual celebration of the Lupercalia; to which they ascribed a secret and mysterious influence on the genial powers of the animal and vegetable world. The bishops of Rome were solicitous to abolish a profane custom, so repugnant to the spirit of Christianity; but their zeal was not supported by the authority of the civil magistrate: the inveterate abuse subsisted till the end of the fifth century, and pope Gelasius, who purified the capital from the last stain of idolatry, appeased, by a formal apology, the murmurs of the senate and people.[3]

In all his public declarations, the emperor Leo assumes the authority, and professes the affection, of a father, for his son Anthemius, with whom he had divided the administration of the universe.[4] The situation, and perhaps the character of Leo, dissuaded him from exposing his person to the toils and dangers of an African war. But the powers of the Eastern empire were (A.D. 468) strenuously exerted to deliver Italy and the Mediterranean from the Vandals; and Genseric, who had so long oppressed both the land and sea, was threatened from every side with a formidable invasion. The campaign was opened by

[1] Ovid (Fast. l. ii. 267.) has given an amusing description of the follies of antiquity, which still inspired much respect.

[2] Dionys. Halicarn. l. i. p. 25. 65. ed. Hudson. The Roman Antiquaries, Donatus (l. ii. c. 18. p. 173.), and Nardini (p. 386.), have laboured to ascertain the true situation of the Lupercal.

[3] Baronius published, from the MSS. of the Vatican, this epistle of pope Gelasius (A.D. 496. No. 28—45.) which is entitled Adversus Andromachum Senatorem, cæterosque Romanos, qui Lupercalia secundum morem pristinum colenda constituebant. Gelasius always supposes that his adversaries are nominal Christians, and that he may not yield to them in prejudice, he imputes to this harmless festival, all the *calamities* of the age.

[4] Itaque nos quibus totius mundi regimen commisit superna provisio. . . . Pius et triumphator semper Augustus filius noster Anthemius, licet Divina Majestas et nostra creatio pietati ejus plenam Imperii commiserit potestatem, &c. . . . Such is the dignified style of Leo, whom Anthemius respectfully names, Dominus et Pater meus Princeps sacratissimus Leo. Novell. Anthem. tit. ii, iii. p. 38. ad calcem Cod. Theod.

a bold and successful enterprise of the præfect Heraclius.[1] The troops of Egypt, Thebais, and Libya, were embarked under his command; and the Arabs, with a train of horses and camels, opened the roads of the desert. Heraclius landed on the coast of Tripoli, surprised and subdued the cities of that province, and prepared, by a laborious march, which Cato had formerly executed,[2] to join the Imperial army under the walls of Carthage. The intelligence of this loss extorted from Genseric some insidious and ineffectual propositions of peace: but he was still more seriously alarmed by the reconciliation of Marcellinus with the two empires. The independent patrician had been persuaded to acknowledge the legitimate title of Anthemius, whom he accompanied in his journey to Rome; the Dalmatian fleet was received into the harbours of Italy; the active valour of Marcellinus expelled the Vandals from the island of Sardinia; and the languid efforts of the West added some weight to the immense preparations of the Eastern Romans. The expence of the naval armament, which Leo sent against the Vandals, has been distinctly ascertained; and the curious and instructive account displays the wealth of the declining empire. The royal demesnes, or private patrimony of the prince, supplied 17,000 pounds of gold; 47,000 pounds of gold, and 700,000 of silver, were levied and paid into the treasury by the Prætorian præfects. But the cities were reduced to extreme poverty; and the diligent calculation of fines and forfeitures, as a valuable object of the revenue, does not suggest the idea of a just, or merciful, administration. The whole expence, by whatsoever means it was defrayed, of the African campaign, amounted to the sum of 130,000 pounds of gold, about £5,200,000, at a time when the value of money appears, from the comparative price of corn, to have been somewhat higher than in the present age.[3] The fleet that sailed from Constantinople to Carthage, consisted of 1113 ships, and the number of soldiers and mariners exceeded 100,000 men. Basiliscus, the brother of the empress Vorina, was entrusted with this important command. His sister, the wife of Leo, had exaggerated the merit of his former exploits against the Scythians. But the discovery of his guilt, or incapacity, was reserved for the African war; and his friends could only save his military reputation, by asserting, that he had conspired with Aspar to spare Genseric, and to betray the last hope of the Western empire.

Experienee has shown, that the success of an invader most com-

[1] The expedition of Heraclius is clouded with difficulties (Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. vi. 640.), and it requires some dexterity to use the circumstances afforded by Theophanes, without injury to the more respectable evidence of Procopius.

[2] The march of Cato from Berenice, in the province of Cyrene, was much longer than that of Heraclius from Tripoli. He passed the deep sandy desert in thirty days, and it was found necessary to provide, besides the ordinary supplies, a great number of skins filled with water, and several *Psylli*, who were supposed to possess the art of sucking the wounds which had been made by the serpents of their native country. Plut. in Caton. Uticens. iv. p. 275. Strabon. Geog. l. xvii. p. 1193.

[3] The principal sum is clearly expressed by Procop. (de Bell. Vand. l. i. c. vi. 191); the smaller constituent parts, which Tillemont (Hist. des Emp. vi. 396.) has laboriously collected from the Byzantine writers, are less certain, and less important. The historian Malchus laments the public misery (Excerpt. ex Suida in Corp. Hist. Byzant. p. 58.); but he is surely unjust, when he charges Leo with hoarding the treasures which he extorted from the people.

monly depends on the vigour and celerity of his operations. The strength and sharpness of the first impression are blunted by delay; the health and spirit of the troops insensibly languish in a distant climate; the naval and military force, a mighty effort which perhaps can never be repeated, is silently consumed; and every hour that is wasted in negociation, accustoms the enemy to contemplate and examine those hostile terrors, which, on their first appearance, he deemed irresistible. The formidable navy of Basiliscus pursued its prosperous navigation from the Thracian Bosphorus to the coast of Africa. He landed his troops at Cape Bona, or the promontory of Mercury, about 40 miles from Carthage.[1] The army of Heraclius, and the fleet of Marcellinus, either joined or seconded the Imperial lieutenant; and the Vandals, who opposed his progress by sea or land, were successively vanquished.[2] If Basiliscus had seized the moment of consternation, and boldly advanced to the capital, Carthage must have surrendered, and the kingdom of the Vandals was extinguished. Genseric beheld the danger with firmness, and eluded it with his veteran dexterity. He protested, in the most respectful language, that he was ready to submit his person, and his dominions, to the will of the emperor; but he requested a truce of five days to regulate the terms of his submission; and it was universally believed, that his secret liberality contributed to the success of this public negociation. Instead of obstinately refusing whatever indulgence his enemy so earnestly solicited, the guilty, or the credulous, Basiliscus consented to the fatal truce; and his imprudent security seemed to proclaim, that he already considered himself as the conqueror of Africa. During this short interval, the wind became favourable to the designs of Genseric. He manned his largest ships of war with the bravest of the Moors and Vandals; and they towed after them many large barks, filled with combustible materials. In the obscurity of the night, these destructive vessels were impelled against the unguarded and unsuspecting fleet of the Romans, who were awakened by the sense of their instant danger. Their close and crowded order assisted the progress of the fire, which was communicated with rapid and irresistible violence; and the noise of the wind, the crackling of the flames, the dissonant cries of the soldiers and mariners, who could neither command, nor obey, increased the horror of the nocturnal tumult. Whilst they laboured to extricate themselves from the fireships, and to save at least a part of the navy, the gallies of Genseric assaulted them with temperate and disciplined valour; and many of the Romans who escaped the fury of the flames, were destroyed or taken by the victorious Vandals. Among the events of that disastrous night, the heroic, or rather desperate, courage of John, one of the principal officers of Basiliscus, has rescued his name from oblivion. When the ship, which he had bravely defended, was almost consumed, he threw himself in his armour into the sea, disdainfully rejected the esteem and pity of Genso, the son of Genseric,

[1] This promontory is 40 miles from Carthage (Procop. l. i. c. 6. p. 192.) and 20 leagues from Sicily (Shaw's Travels, p. 89.). Scipio landed farther in the bay, at the fair promontory; see the animated description of Livy, xxix. 26.

[2] Theophan. (p. 100.) affirms that many ships of the Vandals were sunk. The assertion of Jornandes (de Successione Regn.), that Basiliscus attacked Carthage, must be understood in a very qualified sense.

who pressed him to accept honourable quarter, and sunk under the waves; exclaiming, with his last breath, that he would never fall alive into the hands of those impious dogs. Actuated by a far different spirit, Basiliscus, whose station was the most remote from danger, disgracefully fled in the beginning of the engagement, returned to Constantinople with the loss of more than half of his fleet and army and sheltered his guilty head in the sanctuary of St. Sophia, till his sister, by her tears and entreaties, could obtain his pardon from the indignant emperor. Heraclius effected his retreat through the desert; Marcellinus retired to Sicily, where he was assassinated, perhaps at the instigation of Ricimer, by one of his own captains; and the king of the Vandals expressed his surprise and satisfaction, that the Romans themselves should remove from the world his most formidable antagonists.[1] After the failure of this great expedition, Genseric again became the tyrant of the sea: the coasts of Italy, Greece, and Asia, were again exposed to his revenge and avarice; Tripoli and Sardinia returned to his obedience; he added Sicily to the number of his provinces; and before he died (A.D. 477) in the fulness of years and of glory, he beheld the final extinction of the empire of the West.[2]

During his long (A.D. 462—472) and active reign, the African monarch had studiously cultivated the friendship of the Barbarians of Europe, whose arms he might employ in a seasonable and effectual diversion against the two empires. After the death of Attila, he renewed his alliance with the Visigoths of Gaul; and the sons of the elder Theodoric, who successively reigned over that warlike nation, were easily persuaded, by the sense of interest, to forget the cruel affront which Genseric had inflicted on their sister.[3] The death of the emperor Majorian delivered Theodoric the second from the restraint of fear, and perhaps of honour; he violated his recent treaty with the Romans; and the ample territory of Narbonne, which he firmly united to his dominions, became the immediate reward of his perfidy. The selfish policy of Ricimer encouraged him to invade the provinces which were in the possession of Ægidius, his rival; but the active count, by the defence of Arles, and the victory of Orleans, saved Gaul, and checked, during his lifetime, the progress of the Visigoths. Their ambition was soon rekindled; and the design of extinguishing the Roman empire in Spain and Gaul, was conceived, and almost completed, in the reign of Euric, who assassinated his brother Theodoric, and displayed, with a more savage temper, superior abilities, both in peace and war. He passed the Pyrenees at the head of a numerous army, subdued the cities of Saragossa and Pampeluna, vanquished in battle the martial nobles of the Tarragonese province, carried his victorious arms into the heart of Lusitania, and permitted the Suevi to

[1] Damascius in Vit. Isidor. apud Phot. p. 1048. It will appear, by comparing the three short chronicles of the times, that Marcellinus had fought near Carthage, and was killed in Sicily.

[2] For the African war, see Procop. (de Bell. Vand. l. i. c. 6. p. 191.), Theophan. (p. 99.), Cedrenus (p. 349.), and Zonaras (ii. l. xiv. 50.). Montesquieu (Consid. sur la Grand. &c. c. xx. iii. 497.) has made a judicious observation on the failure of these great naval armaments.

[3] Jornand. is our best guide through the reigns of Theodoric II. and Euric (de Reb Get. c. 44, 45, 46, 47. p. 675.). Idatius ends too soon, and Isidore is too sparing of the information which he might have given on the affairs of Spain. The events that relate to Gaul are aboriously illustrated in the third book of Dubos, Hist. Crit. i. 424.

hold the kingdom of Gallicia under the Gothic monarchy of Spain.[1] The efforts of Euric were not less vigorous or less successful in Gaul; and throughout the country that extends from the Pyrenees to the Rhône and the Loire, Berry, and Auvergne, were the only cities, or dioceses, which refused to acknowledge him as their master.[2] In the defence of Clermont, their principal town, the inhabitants of Auvergne sustained, with inflexible resolution, the miseries of war, pestilence, and famine; and the Visigoths, relinquishing the fruitless siege, suspended the hopes of that important conquest. The youth of the province were animated by the heroic, and almost incredible, valour of Ecdicius, the son of the emperor Avitus,[3] who made a desperate sally with only eighteen horsemen, boldly attacked the Gothic army, and, after maintaining a flying skirmish, retired safe and victorious within the walls of Clermont. His charity was equal to his courage: in a time of extreme scarcity, 4000 poor were fed at his expence; and his private influence levied an army of Burgundians for the deliverance of Auvergne. From *his* virtues alone the faithful citizens of Gaul derived any hopes of safety or freedom; and even such virtues were insufficient to avert the impending ruin of their country, since they were anxious to learn from his authority and example, whether they should prefer the alternative of exile, or servitude.[4] The public confidence was lost; the resources of the state were exhausted; and the Gauls had too much reason to believe, that Anthemius, who reigned in Italy, was incapable of protecting his distressed subjects beyond the Alps. The feeble emperor could only procure for their defence the service of 12,000 British auxiliaries. Riothamus, one of the independent kings, or chieftains, of the island, was persuaded to transport his troops to the continent of Gaul; he sailed up the Loire, and established his quarters in Berry, where the people complained of these oppressive allies, till they were destroyed, or dispersed, by the arms of the Visigoths.[5]

One of the last acts of jurisdiction, which the Roman senate exercised (A.D. 468) over their subjects of Gaul, was the trial and condemnation of Arvandus, the Prætorian præfect. Sidonius, who rejoices that he lived under a reign in which he might pity and assist a state-criminal, has expressed, with tenderness and freedom, the faults of his indiscreet and unfortunate friend.[6] From the perils, which he had escaped, Arvandus imbibed confidence rather than wisdom; and such

[1] Mariana, Hist. Hispan. i. l. v. c. p. 162.

[2] An imperfect, but original, picture of Gaul, more especially of Auvergne, is shown by Sidonius; who, as a senator, and afterwards as a bishop, was deeply interested in the fate of his country. See l. v. epist. 1. 5. 9, &c.

[3] Sid. l. iii. epist. 3. p. 65. Greg. Turon. l. ii. c. 24. ii. 174. Jornan. c. 45. p. 675. Perhaps Ecdicius was only the son-in-law of Avitus, his wife's son by another husband.

[4] Si nullæ a republicâ vires, nulla præsidia, si nullæ, quantum rumor est, Anthemii principis opes, statuit, te auctore, nobilitas seu patriam dimittere seu capillos (Sidon. l. ii. epist. 1. 33.). The last words (Sirmond Not. p. 25.) may likewise denote the clerical tonsure, which was indeed the choice of Sidonius himself.

[5] The history of these Britons may be traced in Jornan. (c. 45. p. 678.), Sidon. (l. iii. epistol. 9. p. 73.), and Greg. of Tours (l. ii. c. 18. ii. 170.). Sidon. (who styles these mercenary troops argutos, armatos, tumultuosos, virtute, numero, contubernio, contumaces) addresses their general in a tone of friendship and familiarity.

[6] Sidon. l. i. epist. 7. p. 15. with Sirmond's notes. This letter does honour to his heart, as well as to his understanding. The prose of Sidonius, however vitiated by a false and affected taste, is much superior to his insipid verses.

was the various, though uniform, imprudence of his behaviour, that his prosperity must appear much more surprising than his downfall. The second præfecture, which he obtained within the term of five years, abolished the merit and popularity of his preceding administration. His easy temper was corrupted by flattery, and exasperated by opposition; he was forced to satisfy his importunate creditors with the spoils of the province; his capricious insolence offended the nobles of Gaul, and he sunk under the weight of the public hatred. The mandate of his disgrace summoned him to justify his conduct before the senate; and he passed the sea of Tuscany with a favourable wind, the presage, as he vainly imagined, of his future fortunes. A decent respect was still observed for the *Præfectorian* rank; and on his arrival at Rome, Arvandus was committed to the hospitality, rather than to the custody, of Flavius Asellus, the count of the sacred largesses, who resided in the Capitol.[1] He was eagerly pursued by his accusers, the four deputies of Gaul, who were all distinguished by their birth, their dignities, or their eloquence. In the name of a great province, and according to the forms of Roman jurisprudence, they instituted a civil and criminal action, requiring such a restitution as might compensate the losses of individuals, and such punishment as might satisfy the justice of the state. Their charges of corrupt oppression were numerous and weighty; but they placed their secret dependence on a letter, which they had intercepted, and which they could prove, by the evidence of his secretary, to have been dictated by Arvandus himself. The author of this letter seemed to dissuade the king of the Goths from a peace with the *Greek* emperor; he suggested the attack of the Britons on the Loire; and he recommended a division of Gaul, according to the law of nations, between the Visigoths and the Burgundians.[2] These pernicious schemes, which a friend could only palliate by the reproaches of vanity and indiscretion, were susceptible of a treasonable interpretation; and the deputies had artfully resolved, not to produce their most formidable weapons till the decisive moment of the contest. But their intentions were discovered by the zeal of Sidonius. He immediately apprised the unsuspecting criminal of his danger; and sincerely lamented, without any mixture of anger, the haughty presumption of Arvandus, who rejected, and even resented, the salutary advice of his friends. Ignorant of his real situation, Arvandus showed himself in the Capitol in the white robe of a candidate, accepted indiscriminate salutations and offers of service, examined the shops of the merchants, the silks and gems, sometimes with the indifference of a spectator, and sometimes with the attention of a purchaser; and complained of the times, of the senate, of the prince, and of the delays of justice. His complaints were soon removed. An early day was fixed for his trial; and Arvandus appeared with his accusers, before a numerous assembly of the Roman senate. The mournful garb, which they affected, excited the

[1] When the Capitol ceased to be a temple, it was appropriated to the use of the civil magistrate; and it is still the residence of the Roman senator. The jewellers, &c. might be allowed to expose their precious wares in the porticoes.

[2] Hæc ad regem Gothorum, charta videbatur emitti, pacem cum Græco Imperatore dissuadens, Britannos super Ligerim sitos impugnari oportere demonstrans, cum Burgundionibus jure gentium Gallias dividi debere confirmans.

compassion of the judges, who were scandalized by the gay and splendid dress of their adversary; and when the præfect Arvandus, with the first of the Gallic deputies, were directed to take their places on the senatorial benches, the same contrast of pride and modesty was observed in their behaviour. In this memorable judgment, which presented a lively image of the old republic, the Gauls exposed, with force and freedom, the grievances of the province; and as soon as the minds of the audience were sufficiently inflamed, they recited the fatal epistle. The obstinacy of Arvandus was founded on the strange supposition, that a subject could not be convicted of treason, unless he had actually conspired to assume the purple. As the paper was read, he repeatedly, and with a loud voice, acknowledged it for his genuine composition; and his astonishment was equal to his dismay, when the unanimous voice of the senate declared him guilty of a capital offence. By their decree, he was degraded from the rank of a præfect to the obscure condition of a plebeian, and ignominiously dragged by servile hands to the public prison. After a fortnight's adjournment, the senate was again convened to pronounce the sentence of his death: but while he expected, in the island of Æsculapius, the expiration of the thirty days allowed by an ancient law to the vilest malefactors,[1] his friends interposed, the emperor Anthemius relented, and the præfect of Gaul obtained the milder punishment of exile and confiscation. The faults of Arvandus might deserve compassion; but the impunity of Seronatus accused the justice of the republic, till he was condemned, and executed, on the complaint of the people of Auvergne. That flagitious minister, the Catiline of his age and country, held a secret correspondence with the Visigoths, to betray the province which he oppressed; his industry was continually exercised in the discovery of new taxes and obsolete offences; and his extravagant vices would have inspired contempt, if they had not excited fear and abhorrence.[2]

Such criminals were not beyond the reach of justice; but, whatever might be the guilt of Ricimer, that powerful Barbarian was able to contend or to negociate with the prince, whose alliance he had condescended to accept. The peaceful and prosperous reign which Anthemius had promised to the West, was (A.D. 471) soon clouded by misfortune and discord. Ricimer, apprehensive, or impatient, of a superior, retired from Rome, and fixed his residence at Milan; an advantageous situation, either to invite, or to repel, the warlike tribes that were seated between the Alps and the Danube.[3] Italy was gradually divided into two independent and hostile kingdoms; and the nobles of Liguria, who trembled at the near approach of a civil war, fell prostrate at the feet of the patrician, and conjured him to spare their

[1] *Senatûs consultum Tiberianum* (Sirmond, Not. p. 17.); but that law allowed only ten days between the sentence and execution: the remaining twenty were added in the reign of Theodosius.

[2] Catilina seculi nostri. Sidon. l. ii. epist. 1. p. 33; l. v. epist. 13. p. 143; l. vii. epist. 7. p. 185. He execrates the crimes, and applauds the punishment, of Seronatus, perhaps with the indignation of a virtuous citizen, perhaps with the resentment of a personal enemy.

[3] Ricimer, under the reign of Anthemius, defeated and slew in battle Beorgor, king of the Alani (Jornan. c. 45. p. 678.). His sister had married the king of the Burgundians, and he maintained an intimate connexion with the Suevic colony established in Pannonia and Noricum.

unhappy country. "For my own part," replied Ricimer, in a tone of insolent moderation, "I am still inclined to embrace the friendship of the "Galatian;[1] but who will undertake to appease his anger, or to mitigate "the pride, which always rises in proportion to our submission?" They informed him, that Epiphanius, bishop of Pavia,[2] united the wisdom of the serpent with the innocence of the dove; and appeared confident, that the eloquence of such an ambassador must prevail against the strongest opposition, either of interest or passion. Their recommendation was approved; and Epiphanius, assuming the benevolent office of mediation, proceeded without delay to Rome, where he was received with the honours due to his merit and reputation. The oration of a bishop in favour of peace may be easily supposed: he argued, that in all possible circumstances, the forgiveness of injuries must be an act of mercy, or magnanimity, or prudence; and he seriously admonished the emperor to avoid a contest with a fierce Barbarian, which might be fatal to himself, and must be ruinous to his dominions. Anthemius acknowledged the truth of his maxims; but he deeply felt, with grief and indignation, the behaviour of Ricimer; and his passion gave eloquence and energy to his discourse. "What favours," he warmly exclaimed, "have we refused to this un-"grateful man? What provocations have we not endured? Regard-"less of the majesty of the purple, I gave my daughter to a Goth; I "sacrificed my own blood to the safety of the republic. The liberality "which ought to have secured the eternal attachment of Ricimer, has "exasperated him against his benefactor. What wars has he not ex-"cited against the empire? How often has he instigated and assisted "the fury of hostile nations? Shall I now accept his perfidious friend-"ship? Can I hope that *he* will respect the engagements of a treaty, "who has already violated the duties of a son?" But the anger of Anthemius evaporated in these passionate exclamations: he insensibly yielded to the proposals of Epiphanius; and the bishop returned to his diocese with the satisfaction of restoring the peace of Italy, by a reconciliation,[3] of which the sincerity and continuance might be reasonably suspected. The clemency of the emperor was extorted from his weakness; and Ricimer suspended his ambitious designs, till he had secretly prepared the engines, with which he resolved to subvert the throne of Anthemius. The mask of peace and moderation was then thrown aside. The army of Ricimer was fortified by a numerous reinforcement of Burgundians and Oriental Suevi: he disclaimed all allegiance to the Greek emperor, marched from Milan to the gates of Rome, and fixing his camp on the banks of the Anio, impatiently expected the arrival of Olybrius, his Imperial candidate.

[1] Galatam concitatum. Sirmond (in his notes to Ennodius) applies this appellation to Anthemius himself. The emperor was probably born in the province of Galatia, whose inhabitants, the Gallo-Grecians, were supposed to unite the vices of a savage, and a corrupted, people.

[2] Epiphanius was thirty years bishop of Pavia (A.D. 467—497; Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xvi. 788.). His name and actions would have been unknown to posterity, if Ennodius, one of his successors, had not written his Life (Sirmond, Opera, i. p. 1647.); in which he represents him as one of the greatest characters of the age.

[3] Ennod. (p. 1659.) has related this embassy of Epiphanius; and his narrative, verbose and turgid as it must appear, illustrates some curious passages in the fall of the Western empire.

The senator Olybrius, of the Anician family, might esteem himself the lawful heir of the Western empire. He had married Placidia, the younger daughter of Valentinian, after she was restored by Genseric; who still detained her sister Eudoxia, as the wife, or rather as the captive, of his son. The king of the Vandals supported, by threats and solicitations, the fair pretensions of his Roman ally; and assigned, as one of the motives of the war, the refusal of the senate and people to acknowledge their lawful prince, and the unworthy preference which they had given to a stranger.[1] The friendship of the public enemy might render Olybrius still more unpopular to the Italians; but when Ricimer meditated the ruin of the emperor Anthemius, he tempted with the offer of a diadem the candidate who could justify his rebellion by an illustrious name, and a royal alliance. The husband of Placidia, who, like most of his ancestors, had been invested with the consular dignity, might have continued to enjoy a secure and splendid fortune in the peaceful residence of Constantinople; nor does he appear to have been tormented by such a genius, as cannot be amused or occupied, unless by the administration of an empire. Yet Olybrius yielded to the importunities of his friends, perhaps of his wife; rashly plunged into the dangers and calamities of a civil war; and (A. D. 472. Mar. 23), with the secret connivance of the emperor Leo, accepted the Italian purple, which was bestowed, and resumed, at the capricious will of a Barbarian. He landed without obstacle (for Genseric was master of the sea) either at Ravenna or the port of Ostia, and immediately proceeded to the camp of Ricimer, where he was received as the sovereign of the Western world.[2]

The patrician, who had extended his posts from the Anio to the Milvian bridge, already possessed two quarters of Rome, the Vatican and the Janiculum, which are separated by the Tyber from the rest of the city;[3] and it may be conjectured, that an assembly of seceding senators imitated, in the choice of Olybrius, the forms of a legal election. But the body of the senate and people firmly adhered to the cause of Anthemius; and the more effectual support of a Gothic army enabled him to prolong his reign, and the public distress, by a resistance of three months, which produced the concomitant evils of famine and pestilence. At length, Ricimer made a furious assault on the bridge of Hadrian, or St. Angelo; and the narrow pass was defended with equal valour by the Goths, till the death of Gilimer their leader. The victorious troops, breaking down every barrier, rushed with irresistible violence into the heart of the city, and Rome (if we may use the

[1] Priscus Excerpt. Legat. p. 74. Procop. de Bell. Vand. l. i. c. 6. p. 191. Eudoxia and her daughter were restored after the death of Majorian. Perhaps the consulship of Olybrius (A.D. 464.) was bestowed as a nuptial present.

[2] The hostile appearance of Olybrius is fixed (notwithstanding the opinion of Pagi) by the duration of his reign. The secret connivance of Leo is acknowledged by Theophanes, and the Paschal Chronicle. We are ignorant of his motives; but, in this obscure period, our ignorance extends to the most public and important facts.

[3] Of the fourteen regions, or quarters, into which Rome was divided by Augustus, only *one*, the Janiculum, lay on the Tuscan side of the Tyber. But, in the fifth century, the Vatican suburb formed a considerable city; and in the ecclesiastical distribution, which had been recently made by Simplicius, the reigning pope, *two* of the *seven* regions, or parishes, of Rome, depended on the church of St. Peter. Nardini Roma Antica, p. 67. It would require a tedious dissertation to mark the circumstances, in which I am inclined to depart from the topography of that learned Roman.

language of a contemporary Pope) was (A.D. 472. July 11) subverted by the civil fury of Anthemius and Ricimer.[1] The unfortunate Anthemius was dragged from his concealment, and inhumanly massacred by the command of his son-in-law; who thus added a third, or perhaps a fourth, emperor to the number of his victims. The soldiers, who united the rage of factious citizens with the savage manners of Barbarians, were indulged, without control, in the licence of rapine and murder: the crowd of slaves and plebeians, who were unconcerned in the event, could only gain by the indiscriminate pillage; and the face of the city exhibited the strange contrast of stern cruelty, and dissolute intemperance.[2] Forty days after (Aug. 20) this calamitous event, the subject, not of glory, but of guilt, Italy was delivered, by a painful disease, from the tyrant Ricimer, who bequeathed the command of his army to his nephew Gundobald, one of the princes of the Burgundians. In the same year, all the principal actors in this great revolution were removed from the stage; and the whole reign of Olybrius, whose death (Oct. 23) does not betray any symptoms of violence, is included within the term of seven months. He left one daughter, the offspring of his marriage with Placidia; and the family of the great Theodosius, transplanted from Spain to Constantinople, was propagated in the female line as far as the eighth generation.[3]

Whilst the vacant throne of Italy was abandoned to lawless Barbarians,[4] the election of a new colleague was seriously agitated in the council of Leo. The empress Verina, studious to promote the greatness of her own family, had married one of her nieces to Julius Nepos, who succeeded his uncle Marcellinus in the sovereignty (A.D. 472—475) of Dalmatia, a more solid possession than the title which he was persuaded to accept, of Emperor of the West. But the measures of the Byzantine court were so languid and irresolute, that many months elapsed after the death of Anthemius, and even of Olybrius, before their destined successor could show himself, with a respectable force, to his Italian subjects. During that interval, Glycerius, an obscure soldier, was invested with the purple by his patron Gundobald; but the Burgundian prince was unable, or unwilling, to support his nomination by a civil war: the pursuits of domestic ambition recalled him beyond the Alps,[5] and his client was permitted to exchange the Roman sceptre for the bishopric of Salona. After extinguishing such a com-

[1] Nuper Anthemii et Ricimeris civili furore subversa est. Gelasius in Epist. ad Andromach. apud Baron. A.D. 496. No. 42. Sigonius (l. l. xiv. de Occid. Imper. p. 542.) and Muratori (Annali d'Italia, iv. 308.), with the aid of a less imperfect MS. of the Hist. Misc., have illustrated this dark and bloody transaction.

[2] Such had been the sæva ac deformis urbe totâ facies, when Rome was assaulted and stormed by the troops of Vespasian (Tacit. Hist. iii. 82.); and every cause of mischief had since acquired much additional energy. The revolution of ages may bring round the same calamities; but ages may revolve, without producing a Tacitus to describe them.

[3] Ducange, Familiæ Byzantin. p. 74. Areobindus, who appears to have married the niece of the emperor Justinian, was the eighth descendant of the elder Theodosius.

[4] The last revolutions of the Western empire are faintly marked in Theophan. (p. 102.), Jornan. (c. 45. p. 679.), Chron. of Marcellin., and the fragments of an anonymous writer, published by Valesius at the end of Ammianus (p. 716.). If Photius had not been so wretchedly concise, we should derive much information from the contemporary histories of Malchus and Candidus. See his Extracts, p. 172.

[5] Greg. Turon. l. ii. c. 28. in ii. 175. Dubos, Hist. Crit. l. 613. By the murder, or death, of his two brothers, Gundobald acquired the sole possession of the kingdom of Burgundy, whose ruin was hastened by their discord.

petitor, the emperor Nepos was acknowledged by the senate, by the Italians, and by the provincials of Gaul; his moral virtues, and military talents, were loudly celebrated; and those who derived any private benefit from his government, announced, in prophetic strains, the restoration of the public felicity.[1] Their hopes (if such hopes had been entertained) were confounded within the term of a single year; and the treaty of peace, which ceded Auvergne to the Visigoths, is the only event of his short and inglorious reign. The most faithful subjects of Gaul were sacrificed, by the Italian emperor, to the hope of domestic security;[2] but his repose was soon invaded by a furious sedition of the Barbarian confederates, who, under the command of Orestes, their general, were in full march from Rome to Ravenna. Nepos trembled at their approach; and, instead of placing a just confidence in the strength of Ravenna, he hastily escaped to his ships, and retired to his Dalmatian principality, on the opposite coast of the Adriatic. By this shameful abdication, he protracted his life about five years, in a very ambiguous state, between an emperor and an exile, till he was assassinated at Salona by the ungrateful Glycerius, who was translated, perhaps as the reward of his crime, to the archbishopric of Milan.[3]

The nations, who had asserted their independence after the death of Attila, were established, by the right of possession or conquest, in the boundless countries to the north of the Danube; or in the Roman provinces between the river and the Alps. But the bravest of their youth enlisted in the army of *confederates*, who formed the defence and the terror of Italy;[4] and in this promiscuous multitude, the names of the Heruli, the Scyrri, the Alani, the Turcilingi, and the Rugians, appear to have predominated. The example of these warriors was (A. D. 475) imitated by Orestes,[5] the son of Tatullus, and the father of the last Roman emperor of the West. Orestes, who has been already mentioned in this history, had never deserted his country. His birth and fortunes rendered him one of the most illustrious subjects of Pannonia. When that province was ceded to the Huns, he entered into the service of Attila, his lawful sovereign, obtained the office of his secretary, and was repeatedly sent ambassador to Constantinople, to represent the person, and signify the commands, of the imperious monarch. The death of that conqueror restored him to his freedom; and Orestes might honourably refuse either to follow the sons of Attila into the Scythian desert, or to obey the Ostrogoths, who had usurped the dominion of Pannonia. He preferred the service of the Italian

[1] Julius Nepos armis pariter summus Augustus ac moribus. Sidonius, l. v. ep. 16. p. 146. Nepos had given to Ecdicius the title of patrician, which Anthemius had promised, decessoris Anthemei fidem absolvit. See l. viii. ep. 7. p. 224.

[2] Epiphanius was sent ambassador from Nepos to the Visigoths, for the purpose of ascertaining the *fines Imperii Italici* (Ennodius in Sirmond, i. 1665.). His pathetic discourse concealed the disgraceful secret, which soon excited the just and bitter complaints of the bishop of Clermont.

[3] Malchus, apud Phot. p. 172. Ennod. Epigram. lxxxii. in Sirmond Oper. i. 1879. Some doubt however may be raised on the identity of the emperor and the archbishop.

[4] Our knowledge of these mercenaries, who subverted the Western empire, is derived from Procop. de Bell. Goth. l. i. c. i. p. 308.). The popular opinion, and the recent historians, represent Odoacer in the false light of a *stranger*, and a *king*, who invaded Italy with an army of foreigners, his native subjects.

[5] Orestes, qui eo tempore quando Attila ad Italiam venit, se illi junxit, et ejus notarius factus fuerat. Anonym. Vales. p. 716. He is mistaken in the date; but we may credit his assertion, that the secretary of Attila was the father of Augustulus.

princes, the successors of Valentinian; and, as he possessed the qualifications of courage, industry, and experience, he advanced with rapid steps in the military profession, till he was elevated, by the favour of Nepos himself, to the dignities of patrician, and master-general of the troops. These troops had been long accustomed to reverence the character and authority of Orestes, who affected their manners, conversed with them in their own language, and was intimately connected with their national chieftains, by long habits of familiarity and friendship. At his solicitation they rose in arms against the obscure Greek, who presumed to claim their obedience; and when Orestes, from some secret motive, declined the purple, they consented, with the same facility, to acknowledge (A.D. 476) his son Augustulus, as the emperor of the West. By the abdication of Nepos, Orestes had now attained the summit of his ambitious hopes; but he soon discovered, before the end of the first year, that the lessons of perjury and ingratitude, which a rebel must inculcate, will be retorted against himself; and that the precarious sovereign of Italy was only permitted to chuse, whether he would be the slave, or the victim, of his Barbarian mercenaries. The dangerous alliance of these strangers had oppressed and insulted the last remains of Roman freedom and dignity. At each revolution, their pay and privileges were augmented; but their insolence increased in a still more extravagant degree; they envied the fortune of their brethren in Gaul, Spain, and Africa, whose victorious arms had acquired an independent and perpetual inheritance; and they insisted on their peremptory demand, that a *third* part of the lands of Italy should be immediately divided among them. Orestes, with a spirit which, in another situation, might be entitled to our esteem, chose rather to encounter the rage of an armed multitude, than to subscribe the ruin of an innocent people. He rejected the audacious demand; and his refusal was favourable to the ambition of Odoacer; a bold Barbarian, who assured his fellow-soldiers, that, if they dared to associate under his command, they might soon extort the justice which had been denied to their dutiful petitions. From all the camps and garrisons of Italy, the confederates, actuated by the same resentment and the same hopes, impatiently flocked to the standard of this popular leader; and the unfortunate patrician, overwhelmed by the torrent, hastily retreated to the strong city of Pavia, the episcopal seat of the holy Epiphanites. Pavia was immediately besieged, the fortifications were stormed, the town was pillaged; and although the bishop might labour, with much zeal and some success, to save the property of the church, the tumult could only be appeased by the execution of Orestes.[1] His brother Paul was slain in an action near Ravenna; and the helpless Augustulus, who could no longer command the respect, was reduced to implore the clemency, of Odoacer.

That successful Barbarian was the son of Edecon; who, in some remarkable transactions, particularly described in a preceding chapter, had been the colleague of Orestes himself. The honour of an ambassador should be exempt from suspicion; and Edecon had listened

[1] Eunod. (in Vit. Epiphan. Sirmond, i. 1669.). He adds weight to the narrative of Procopius, though we may doubt whether the devil actually contrived the siege of Pavia, to distress the bishop and his flock.

to a conspiracy against the life of his sovereign. But this apparent guilt was expiated by his merit or repentance: his rank was eminent and conspicuous; he enjoyed the favour of Attila; and the troops under his command, who guarded, in their turn, the royal village, consisted in a tribe of Scyrri, his immediate and hereditary subjects. In the revolt of the nations, they still adhered to the Huns; and, more than twelve years afterwards, the name of Edecon is honourably mentioned, in their unequal contest with the Ostrogoths; which was terminated, after two bloody battles, by the defeat and dispersion of the Scyrri.[1] Their gallant leader, who did not survive this national calamity, left two sons, Onulf and Odoacer, to struggle with adversity, and to maintain as they might, by rapine or service, the faithful followers of their exile. Onulf directed his steps towards Constantinople, where he sullied, by the assassination of a generous benefactor, the fame which he had acquired in arms. His brother Odoacer led a wandering life among the Barbarians of Noricum, with a mind and a fortune suited to the most desperate adventures; and when he had fixed his choice, he piously visited the cell of Severinus, the popular saint of the country, to solicit his approbation and blessing. The lowness of the door would not admit the lofty stature of Odoacer: he was obliged to stoop; but in that humble attitude the saint could discern the symptoms of his future greatness; and addressing him in a prophetic tone, "Pursue" (said he) "your design; proceed to Italy; you will soon cast away this "coarse garment of skins; and your wealth will be adequate to the "liberality of your mind."[2] The Barbarian, whose daring spirit accepted and ratified the prediction, was admitted into the service of the Western empire, and soon obtained an honourable rank in the guards. His manners were gradually polished, his military skill was improved, and the confederates of Italy would not have elected him for their general, unless the exploits of Odoacer had established a high opinion of his courage and capacity.[3] Their military acclamations saluted him with the title of king: but he abstained, during his whole reign (A.D. 476—490), from the use of the purple and diadem,[4] lest he should offend those princes, whose subjects, by their accidental mixture, had formed the victorious army which time and policy might insensibly unite into a great nation.

Royalty was familiar to the Barbarians, and the submissive people of Italy was prepared to obey, without a murmur, the authority which he should condescend to exercise (A.D. 476, or A.D. 479) as the vicegerent of the emperor of the West. But Odoacer had resolved to

[1] Jornan. c. 53, 54. p. 692. M. de Buat (Hist. des Peup.' de l'Eur. viii. 221.) has clearly explained the origin and adventures of Odoacer. I am almost inclined to believe that he was the same who pillaged Angers, and commanded a fleet of Saxon pirates on the ocean. Greg. Turon. l. ii. c. 18. in ii. 170.

[2] Vade ad Italiam, vade vilissimus nunc pellibus coopertis: sed multis cito plurima largiturus. Anonym. Vales. p. 717. He quotes the Life of St. Severinus, which is extant, and contains much unknown and valuable history; it was composed by his disciple Eugippius (A.D. 511.) thirty years after his death. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xvi. 168.

[3] Theophanes, who calls him a Goth, affirms, that he was educated, nursed (τραφεντος), in Italy (p. 102.); and as this strong expression will not bear a literal interpretation, it must be explained by long service in the Imperial guards.

[4] Nomen regis Odoacer assumpsit, cum tamen neque purpurâ nec regalibus uteretur insignibus. Cassiodor. in Chron. A.D. 476. He seems to have assumed the abstract title of a king, without applying it to any particular nation or country.

shelter and subsistence; whose legions were buried in these religious sanctuaries; and the same cause, which relieved the distress of individuals, impaired the strength and fortitude of the empire.[1]

The monastic profession of the ancients wa an act of voluntary devotion. The inconstant fanatic was threatened with the eternal vengeance of the God whom he deserted: but the doors of the monastery were still open for repentance. Those monks, whose conscience was fortified by reason or passion, were at liberty to resume the character of men and citizens; and even the spouses of Christ might accept the legal embraces of an earthly lover.[3] The examples of scandal, and the progress of superstition, suggested the propriety of more forcible restraints. After a sufficient trial, the fidelity of the novice was secured by a solemn and perpetual vow; and his irrevocable engagement was ratified by the laws of the church and state. A guilty fugitive was pursued, arrested, and restored to his perpetual prison; and the interposition of the magistrate oppressed the freedom and merit, which had alleviated, in some degree, the abject slavery of the monastic discipline.[4] The actions of a monk, his words, and even his thoughts, were determined by an inflexible rule,[5] or a capricious superior: the slightest offences were corrected by disgrace or confinement, extraordinary fasts or bloody flagellation; and disobedience, murmur, or delay, were ranked in the catalogue of the most heinous sins.[6] A blind submission to the commands of the abbot, however absurd, or even criminal, they might seem, was the ruling principle, the first virtue of the Egyptian monks; and their patience was frequently exercised by the most extravagant trials. They were directed to remove an enormous rock; assiduously to water a barren staff, that was planted in the ground, till, at the end of three years, it should vegetate and blossom like a tree; to walk into a fiery furnace; or to cast their infant into a deep pond: and several saints, or madmen, have been immortalized in monastic story, by their thoughtless, and

[1] See a very sensible preface of Lucas Holstenius to the Codex Regularum. The emperors attempted to support the obligation of public and private duties; but the feeble dykes were swept away by the torrent of superstition: and Justinian surpassed the most sanguine wishes of the monks (Thomassin, i. p. 1782—1799. and Bingham, l. vii. c. 3. p. 253.).

[2] The monastic institutions, particularly those of Egypt, about the year 400, are described by four curious and devout travellers; Rufinus (Vit. Patrum, l. ii, iii. p. 424—536.) Posthumian (Sulp. Sever. Dialog. i.), Palladius (Hist. Lausiac. in Vit. Patrum, p. 709—863.), and Cassian (vii. Bibliothec. Max. Patrum, his four first books of Institutes, and the twenty-four Collations or Conferences.).

[3] The example of Malchus (Jerom, i. p. 256.), and the design of Cassian and his friend (Collation xxiv. 1.) are incontestable proofs of their freedom; which is elegantly described by Erasmus in his Life of St. Jerom. Chardon, Hist. des Sacremens, vi. p. 279—300.

[4] Laws of Justinian (Novel. cxxiii. No. 42.), and of Lewis the Pious (in the historians of France, vi. p. 427.), and the actual jurisprudence of France, in Denissart (Decisions, &c. iv. p. 855, &c.).

[5] The ancient Codex Regularum, collected by Benedict Anianinus, the reformer of the monks in the beginning of the ninth century, and published in the seventeenth, by Lucas Holstenius, contains thirty different rules for men and women. Of these, seven were composed in Egypt, one in the East, one in Cappadocia, one in Italy, one in Africa, four in Spain, eight in Gaul, or France, and one in England.

[6] The rule of Columbanus, so prevalent in the West, inflicts one hundred lashes for very slight offences (Cod. Reg. part ii. p. 174.). Before the time of Charlemagne, the abbots indulged themselves in mutilating their monks, or putting out their eyes; a punishment much less cruel than the tremendous *vade in pace* (the subterranean dungeon, or sepulchre), which was afterwards invented. See an admirable discourse of the learned Mabillon (Oeuv. Posthum. ii. p. 321—336.); who, on this occasion, seems to be inspired by the genius of humanity. For such an effort, I can forgive his defence of the holy tear of Vendome (p. 361—399.).

fearless obedience.[1] The freedom of the mind, the source of every generous and rational sentiment, was destroyed by the habits of credulity and submission; and the monk, contracting the vices of a slave, devoutly followed the faith and passions of his ecclesiastical tyrant. The peace of the Eastern church was invaded by a swarm of fanatics, incapable of fear, or reason, or humanity; and the Imperial troops acknowledged, without shame, that they were much less apprehensive of an encounter with the fiercest Barbarians.[2]

Superstition has often framed and consecrated the fantastic garments of the monks:[3] but their apparent singularity sometimes proceeds from their uniform attachment to a simple and primitive model, which the revolutions of fashion have made ridiculous in the eyes of mankind. The father of the Benedictines expressly disclaims all idea of choice, or merit; and soberly exhorts his disciples to adopt the coarse and convenient dress of the countries which they may inhabit.[4] The monastic habits of the ancients varied with the climate, and their mode of life; and they assumed, with the same indifference, the sheepskin of the Egyptian peasants, or the cloak of the Grecian philosophers. They allowed themselves the use of linen in Egypt, where it was a cheap and domestic manufacture; but in the West, they rejected such an expensive article of foreign luxury.[5] It was the practice of the monks either to cut or shave their hair; they wrapped their heads in a cowl, to escape the sight of profane objects; their legs and feet were naked, except in the extreme cold of winter; and their slow and feeble steps were supported by a long staff. The aspect of a genuine anachoret was horrid and disgusting: every sensation that is offensive to man, was thought acceptable to God; and the angelic rule of Tabenne condemned the salutary custom of bathing the limbs in water, and of anointing them with oil.[6] The austere monks slept on the ground, on a hard mat, or a rough blanket; and the same bundle of palm-leaves served them as a seat in the day, and a pillow in the night. Their original cells were low narrow huts, built of the slightest materials; which formed, by the regular distribution of the streets, a large and populous village, inclosing within the common wall, a church, an hospital, perhaps a library, some necessary offices, a garden, and a fountain or reservoir of fresh water. Thirty or forty brethren composed a family of separate discipline and diet; and the great monasteries of Egypt consisted of thirty or forty families.

Pleasure and guilt are synonymous terms in the language of the

[1] Sulp. Sever. Dialog. i. 12, 13. p. 532, &c. Cassian. Institut. l. iv. c. 26, 27. "Præcipua "ibi virtus et prima est obedientia." Among the verba seniorum (in Vit. Patrum, l. v. p. 617.), the fourteenth libel or discourse is on the subject of obedience; and the Jesuit Rosweyde, who published that huge volume for the use of convents, has collected all the scattered passages in his two copious indexes.

[2] Jortin (Remarks on Eccles. Hist. iv. p. 161.) has observed the scandalous valour of the Cappadocian monks, which was exemplified in the banishment of Chrysostom.

[3] Cassian has simply, though copiously, described the monastic habit of Egypt (Institut. l. .), to which Soz. (l. iii. c. 14.) attributes such allegorical meaning and virtue.

[4] Regul. Benedict. No. 55. in Cod. Regul. part ii. p. 51.

[5] Rule of Ferreolus, bishop of Ufez (No. 31. in Cod. Regul. part ii. p. 136.), and of Isidore, bishop of Seville (No. 13. in Cod. Regul. part ii. p. 214.).

[6] Some partial indulgences were granted for the hands and feet. "Totum autem corpus "nemo unguet nisi causâ infirmitatis, nec lavabitur aquâ nudo corpore, nisi languor perspicuus "sit" (Regul. Pachom. xcii. part i. p. 78.).

Odoacer was the first Barbarian who reigned in Italy, over a people who had once asserted their just superiority above the rest of mankind. The disgrace of the Romans still excites our respectful compassion, and we fondly sympathize with the imaginary grief and indignation of their degenerate posterity. But the calamities of Italy had gradually subdued the proud consciousness of freedom and glory. In the age of Roman virtue, the provinces were subject to the arms, and the citizens to the laws, of the republic; till those laws were subverted by civil discord, and both the city and the provinces became the servile property of a tyrant. The forms of the constitution, which alleviated or disguised their abject slavery, were abolished by time and violence; the Italians alternately lamented the presence or the absence of the sovereigns whom they detested or despised; and the succession of five centuries inflicted the various evils of military licence, capricious despotism, and elaborate oppression. During the same period, the Barbarians had emerged from obscurity and contempt, and the warriors of Germany and Scythia were introduced into the provinces, as the servants, the allies, and at length the masters, of the Romans, whom they insulted or protected. The hatred of the people was suppressed by fear; they respected the spirit and splendour of the martial chiefs who were invested with the honours of the empire; and the fate of Rome had long depended on the sword of those formidable strangers. The stern Ricimer, who trampled on the ruins of Italy, had exercised the power, without assuming the title, of a king; and the patient Romans were insensibly prepared to acknowledge the royalty of Odoacer and his Barbaric successors.

The king of Italy (A.D. 476—490) was not unworthy of the high station to which his valour and fortune had exalted him: his savage manners were polished by the habits of conversation; and he respected, though a conqueror and a Barbarian, the institutions, and even the prejudices, of his subjects. After an interval of seven years, Odoacer restored the consulship of the West. For himself, he modestly, or proudly, declined an honour which was still accepted by the emperors of the East; but the curule chair was successively filled by eleven of the most illustrious senators;[1] and the list is adorned by the respectable name of Basilius, whose virtues claimed the friendship and grateful applause of Sidonius, his client.[2] The laws of the emperors were strictly enforced, and the civil administration of Italy was still exercised by the Prætorian præfect, and his subordinate officers. Odoacer devolved on the Roman magistrates the odious and oppressive task of collecting the public revenue; but he reserved for himself the merit of seasonable and popular indulgence.[3] Like the rest of the Barbarians,

litan lady invited the saint to the Lucullan villa, in the place of Augustulus, who was probably no more. Baron. (Annal. Eccles. A.D. 496. No. 50, 51.) and Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. xvi. 178.), from the original Life by Eugipius. The narrative of the last migration of Severinus to Naples, is likewise an authentic piece.

[1] The consular Fasti may be found in Pagi or Muratori. The consuls named by Odoacer, or perhaps by the Roman senate, appear to have been acknowledged in the Eastern empire.

[2] Sidon. (l. i. epist. 9. p. 22. ed. Sirmond) has compared the two leading senators of his time (A.D. 468.), Gennadius Avienus and Cæcina Basilius To the former he assigns the specious, to the latter the solid, virtues of public and private life. A Basilius junior, possibly his son, was consul in the year 480.

[3] Epiphanius interceded for the people of Pavia; and the king first granted an indulgence

he had been instructed in the Arian heresy; but he revered the monastic and episcopal characters; and the silence of the Catholics attests the toleration which they enjoyed. The peace of the city required the interposition of his præfect Basilius, in the choice of a Roman pontiff: the decree which restrained the clergy from alienating their lands, was ultimately designed for the benefit of the people, whose devotion would have been taxed to repair the dilapidations of the church.[1] Italy was protected by the arms of its conqueror; and its frontiers were respected by the Barbarians of Gaul and Germany, who had so long insulted the feeble race of Theodosius. Odoacer passed the Hadriatic, to chastise the assassins of the emperor Nepos, and to acquire the maritime province of Dalmatia. He passed the Alps, to rescue the remains of Noricum from Fava, or Feletheus, king of the Rugians, who held his residence beyond the Danube. The king was vanquished in battle, and led away prisoner; a numerous colony of captives and subjects was transported into Italy; and Rome, after a long period of defeat and disgrace, might claim the triumph of her Barbarian master.[2]

Notwithstanding the prudence and success of Odoacer, his kingdom exhibited the sad prospect of misery and desolation. Since the age of Tiberius, the decay of agriculture had been felt in Italy; and it was a just subject of complaint that the life of the Roman people depended on the accidents of the winds and waves.[3] In the division and the decline of the empire, the tributary harvests of Egypt and Africa were withdrawn; the numbers of the inhabitants continually diminished with the means of subsistence; and the country was exhausted by the irretrievable losses of war, famine,[4] and pestilence. St. Ambrose has deplored the ruin of a populous district, which had been once adorned with the flourishing cities of Bologna, Modena, Regium, and Placentia.[5] Pope Gelasius was a subject of Odoacer; and he affirms, with strong exaggeration, that in Æmilia, Tuscany, and the adjacent provinces, the human species was almost extirpated.[6] The plebeians of Rome, who were fed by the hand of their master, perished or disappeared, as soon as his liberality was suppressed; the decline of the arts reduced the industrious mechanic to idleness and want; and the senators, who might support with patience the ruin of their country, bewailed their private loss of wealth and luxury. One-third

of five years, and afterwards relieved them from the oppression of Pelagius, the Prætorian præfect (Ennod. in Vit. St. Epiphan. in Sirmond. Oper. i. 1670.).

[1] Baron. Annal. Eccles. A.D. 483. No. 10—15. Sixteen years afterwards, the irregular proceedings of Basilius were condemned by pope Symmachus in a Roman synod.

[2] The wars of Odoacer are concisely mentioned by Paul the Deacon (de Gest. Langobard, l. i. c. 19. p. 757. ed. Grot.), and in the two Chronicles of Cassiodor. and Cuspin. The Life of St. Severinus, by Eugipius, which the Count de Buat (Hist. des Peup. &c. viii. c. 1. 4. 8, 9.) has diligently studied, illustrates the ruin of Noricum and the Bavarian antiquities.

[3] Tacit. Annal. iii. 53. Recherch. sur l'Adminis. des Ter. chez les Romains (351.) clearly state the progress of internal decay.

[4] A famine, which afflicted Italy at the time of the irruption of Odoacer, king of the Heruli, is eloquently described in prose and verse, by a French poet (Les Mois, ii. 174.). I am ignorant from whence he derives his information; but I am well assured that he relates some facts incompatible with the truth of history.

[5] Epistle xxxix. of St. Ambrose is quoted by Muratori, sopra le Antichità Italiane, i. Dissert. xxi. 354.

[6] Æmilia, Tuscia, ceteræque provinciæ in quibus hominum prope nullus exsistit. Gelasius, Epist. ad Andromachum, ap. Baron. Annal. Eccles. A.D. 496. No. 36.

of those ample estates, to which the ruin of Italy is originally imputed,[1] was extorted for the use of the conquerors. Injuries were aggravated by insults; the sense of actual sufferings was embittered by the fear of more dreadful evils; and as new lands were allotted to new swarms of Barbarians, each senator was apprehensive lest the arbitrary surveyors should approach his favourite villa, or his most profitable farm. The least unfortunate were those who submitted without a murmur to the power which it was impossible to resist. Since they desired to live, they owed some gratitude to the tyrant who had spared their lives; and since he was the absolute master of their fortunes, the portion which he left must be accepted as his pure and voluntary gift.[2] The distress of Italy was mitigated by the prudence and humanity of Odoacer, who had bound himself, at the price of his elevation, to satisfy the demands of a licentious and turbulent multitude. The kings of the Barbarians were frequently resisted, deposed, or murdered, by their *native* subjects; and the various bands of Italian mercenaries, who associated under the standard of an elective general, claimed a larger privilege of freedom and rapine. A monarchy destitute of national union, and hereditary right, hastened to its dissolution. After a reign of fourteen years, Odoacer was oppressed by the superior genius of Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths; a hero alike excellent in the arts of war and of government, who restored an age of peace and prosperity, and whose name still excites and deserves the attention of mankind.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

Origin, Progress, and Effects of the Monastic Life.—Conversion of the Barbarians to Christianity and Arianism.—Persecution of the Vandals in Africa.—Extinction of Arianism among the Barbarians.

THE indissoluble connexion of civil and ecclesiastical affairs, has compelled and encouraged me to relate the progress, the persecutions, the establishment, the divisions, the final triumph, and the gradual corruption of Christianity. I have purposely delayed the consideration of two religious events, interesting in the study of human nature, and important in the decline and fall of the Roman empire. I. The institution of the monastic life;[3] and, II. The conversion of the northern Barbarians.

[1] Verumque confitentibus, latifundia perdidere Italiam. Plin. Hist. Natur. xviii. 7.

[2] Such are the topics of consolation, or rather of patience, which Cicero (ad Familiares, l. ix. epist. 17.) suggests to his friend Papirius Pætus, under the military despotism of Cæsar. The argument, however, of "vivere pulcherrimum duxi," is more forcibly addressed to a Roman philosopher, who possessed the free alternative of life or death.

[3] The origin of the monastic institution has been laboriously discussed by Thomasin (Discip. de l'Eglise, i. p. 1419—1426.) and Helyot (Hist. des Ordres Monastiques, i. p. 1—66.). These authors are very learned and tolerably honest, and their difference of opinion shows the subject in its full extent. Yet the cautious Protestant, who distrusts *any* Popish guides, may consult the seventh book of Bingham's Christian Antiquities.

I. Prosperity and peace introduced the distinction of the *vulgar* and the *Ascetic Christians*.[1] The loose and imperfect practice of religion satisfied the conscience of the multitude. The prince or magistrate, the soldier or merchant, reconciled their fervent zeal, and implicit faith, with the exercise of their profession, the pursuit of their interest, and the indulgence of their passions: but the Ascetics who obeyed and abused the rigid precepts of the gospel, were inspired by the savage enthusiasm, which represents man as a criminal, and God as a tyrant. They seriously renounced the business, and the pleasures, of the age; abjured the use of wine, of flesh, and of marriage; chastised their body, mortified their affections, and embraced a life of misery, as the price of eternal happiness. In the reign of Constantine, the Ascetics fled from a profane and degenerate world, to perpetual solitude, or religious society. Like the first Christians of Jerusalem,[2] they resigned the use, or the property, of their temporal possessions; established regular communities of the same sex, and a similar disposition; and assumed the names of *Hermits*, *Monks*, and *Anachorets*, expressive of their lonely retreat in a natural or artificial desert. They soon acquired the respect of the world, which they despised; and the loudest applause was bestowed on this DIVINE PHILOSOPHY,[3] which surpassed, without the aid of science or reason, the laborious virtues of the Grecian schools. The monks might indeed contend with the Stoics, in the contempt of fortune, of pain, and of death: the Pythagorean silence and submission were revived in their servile discipline; and they disdained, as firmly as the Cynics themselves, all the forms and decencies of civil society. But the votaries of this Divine Philosophy aspired to imitate a purer and more perfect model. They trod in the footsteps of the prophets, who had retired to the desert;[4] and they restored the devout and contemplative life, which had been instituted by the Essenians, in Palestine and Egypt. The philosophic eye of Pliny had surveyed with astonishment a solitary people, who dwelt among the palm-trees near the Dead Sea; who subsisted without money, who were propagated without women; and who derived from the disgust and repentance of mankind, a perpetual supply of voluntary associates.[5]

1 Euseb. Demonstrat. Evangel. (l. i. p. 20, 21. edit. Græc. Rob. Stephani, Paris, 1545.). In his Ecclesiastical History, published twelve years after the Demonstration, Eusebius (l. ii. c. 17.) asserts the Christianity of the Therapeutæ; but he appears ignorant, that a similar institution was actually revived in Egypt.

2 Cassian (Collat. xviii. 5.) claims this origin for the institution of the *Cœnobites*, which gradually decayed till it was restored by Anthony and his disciples.

3 *Ωφελιμωτατον γαρ τι χρημα εις ανθροπους ελθουσα παρα Θεου η τοιαυτη φιλοσοφια*. These are the expressive words of Sozomen, who copiously and agreeably describes (l. i. c. 12, 13, 14.) the origin and progress of this monkish philosophy (Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. ii. p. 1441.). Some modern writers, Lipsius (iv. p. 448. Manuduct. ad Philos. Stoic. iii. 13.), and La Mothe le Vayer (ix. de la Vertù des Payens, p. 228—262.), have compared the Carmelites to the Pythagoreans, and the Cynics to the Capuchins.

4 The Carmelites derive their pedigree, in regular succession, from the prophet Elijah (Theses of Beziers, A.D. 1682. in Bayle's Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Oeuvres, i. p. 82, &c. and the prolix irony of the Ordres Monastiques, an anonymous work, i. p. 1—433. Berlin, 1751.). Rome, and the inquisition of Spain, silenced the profane criticism of the Jesuits of Flanders (Helyot, Hist. des Ordres Monastiques, i. p. 282—300.), and the statue of Elijah, the Carmelite, has been erected in the church of St. Peter (Voyages du P. Labat, iii. p. 87).

5 Plin. Hist. Natur. v. 15. Gens sola, et in toto orbe præter ceteras mira, sine ullâ feminâ, omni venere abdicatâ, sine pecuniâ, socia palmarum. Ita per seculorum millia (incredibile

Egypt, the fruitful parent of superstition, afforded the first example of the monastic life. Antony[1] (A.D. 305), an illiterate[2] youth of the lower parts of Thebais, distributed his patrimony,[3] deserted his family and native home, and executed his *monastic* penance with original and intrepid fanaticism. After a long and painful noviciate, among the tombs, and in a ruined tower, he boldly advanced into the desert three days' journey to the eastward of the Nile; discovered a lonely spot, which possessed the advantages of shade and water, and fixed his last residence on mount Colzim near the Red Sea; where an ancient monastery still preserves the name and memory of the saint.[4] The curious devotion of the Christians pursued him to the desert; and when he was obliged to appear at Alexandria, in the face of mankind, he supported his fame with discretion and dignity. He enjoyed the friendship of Athanasius, whose doctrine he approved; and the Egyptian peasant respectfully declined a respectful invitation from the emperor Constantine. The venerable patriarch (for Antony attained the age of one hundred and five years) (A.D. 251—356) beheld the numerous progeny which had been formed by his example and his lessons. The prolific colonies of monks multiplied with rapid increase on the sands of Libya, upon the rocks of Thebais, and in the cities of the Nile. To the south of Alexandria, the mountain, and adjacent desert, of Nitria, were peopled by five thousand anachorets; and the traveller may still investigate the ruins of fifty monasteries, which were planted in that barren soil, by the disciples of Antony.[5] In the Upper Thebais, the vacant Island of Tabenne[6] was occupied by Pachomius, and fourteen hundred of his brethren. That holy abbot successively founded nine monasteries of men, and one of women; and the festival of Easter sometimes collected fifty thousand religious persons, who followed his

dictu) gens æterna est in quâ nemo nascitur. Tam fœcunda illis aliorum vitæ pœnitentia est. He places them just beyond the noxious influence of the lake, and names Engaddi and Masada as the nearest towns. The Laura, and monastery of St. Sabas, could not be far distant from this place. Reland, Palestin. i. p. 295. ii. p. 763. 874. 880. 890.

[1] Athanas. Op. ii. p. 450—505. and the Vit. Patrum, p. 26—74. with Rosweyde's Annotations. The former is the Greek original; the latter a very ancient Latin version by Evagrius, the friend of St. Jerom.

[2] *Γραμματα μεν μαθειν ουκ ηνεσχετο.* Athanas. ii. in Vit. St. Anton. p. 452.; and the assertion of his total ignorance has been received by many of the ancients and moderns. But Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. vii. p. 666.) shows, by some probable arguments, that Antony could read and write in the Coptic, his native tongue; and that he was only a stranger to the *Greek letters.* The philosopher Synesius (p. 51.) acknowledges, that the natural genius of Antony did not require the aid of learning.

[3] *Aruræ* autem erant ei trecentæ uberes, et valde optimæ (Vit. Patr. l. i. p. 36.). If the *arura* be a square measure of an hundred Egyptian cubits (Rosweyde, Onomasticon ad Vit. Patrum, p. 1014, 1015.), and the Egyptian cubit of all ages be equal to twenty-two English inches (Graves, i. p. 233.), the arura will consist of about three quarters of an English acre.

[4] The description of the monastery is given by Jerom (i. p. 248, 249. in Vit. Hilarion), and the P. Sicard (Missions du Levant, v. p. 122—200.). Their accounts cannot always be reconciled: the Father painted from his fancy, and the Jesuit from his experience.

[5] Jerom, i. p. 146. ad Eustochium. Hist. Lausiac. c. 7. in Vit. Patrum, p. 712. The P. Sicard (Missions du Levant, ii. p. 29—79.) visited, and has described, this desert, which now contains four monasteries, and 20 or 30 monks. D'Anville, Descrip. de l'Egypte, p. 74.

[6] Tabenne is a small island in the Nile, in the diocese of Tentyra or Dendera, between the modern town of Girge and the ruins of ancient Thebes (D'Anville, p. 194.). M. de Tillemont doubts whether it was an isle; but I may conclude, from his own facts, that the primitive name was afterwards transferred to the great monastery of Bau or Pabau (Mem. Eccles. vii. p. 678. 688.).

angelic rule of discipline.[1] The stately and populous city of Oxyrinchus, the seat of Christian orthodoxy, had devoted the temples, the public edifices, and even the ramparts, to pious and charitable uses; and the bishop, who might preach in twelve churches, computed ten thousand females, and twenty thousand males, of the monastic profession.[2] The Egyptians, who gloried in this marvellous revolution, were disposed to hope, and to believe, that the number of the monks was equal to the remainder of the people;[3] and posterity might repeat the saying, which had formerly been applied to the sacred animals of the same country, That, in Egypt, it was less difficult to find a god, than a man.

Athanasius introduced into Rome the knowledge and practice of the monastic life (A.D. 341); and a school of this new philosophy was opened by the disciples of Antony, who accompanied their primate to the holy threshold of the Vatican. The strange and savage appearance of these Egyptians excited, at first, horror and contempt, and, at length, applause and zealous imitation. The senators, and more especially the matrons, transformed their palaces and villas into religious houses; and the narrow institution of *six* Vestals, was eclipsed by the frequent monasteries, which were seated on the ruins of ancient temples, and in the midst of the Roman Forum.[4] Inflamed by the example of Antony, a Syrian youth, whose name was Hilarion[5] (A.D. 328), fixed his dreary abode on a sandy beach, between the sea and a morass, about seven miles from Gaza. The austere penance, in which he persisted forty-eight years, diffused a similar enthusiasm; and the holy man was followed by a train of two or three thousand anachorets, whenever he visited the innumerable monasteries of Palestine. The fame of Basil[6] (A.D. 360) is immortal in the monastic history of the East. With a mind, that had tasted the learning and eloquence of Athens; with an ambition, scarcely to be satisfied by the archbishopric of Cæsarea, Basil retired to a savage solitude in Pontus; and deigned, for a while, to give laws to the spiritual colonies which he profusely scattered along the coast of the Black Sea. In the West, Martin of Tours[7] (A.D. 370), a soldier, an hermit, a bishop, and a saint, established the monasteries of Gaul; two thousand of his disciples followed him to the grave; and his eloquent historian challenges the

[1] Codex Regularum (published by Lucas Holstenius, Rome, 1661.), a preface of St. Jerom to his Latin version of the Rule of Pachomius, i. p. 61.

[2] Rufin. c. 5. in Vit. Patrum, p. 459. He calls it, civitas ampla valde et populosa, and reckons twelve churches. Strabo (l. xvii. p. 1166.) and Ammianus (xxii. 16.) have made honourable mention of Oxyrinchus, whose inhabitants adored a small fish in a magnificent temple.

[3] Quanti populi habentur in urbibus, tanta pæne habentur in desertis multitudines monachorum. Rufin. c. 7. in Vit. Patrum, p. 461. He congratulates the fortunate change.

[4] The introduction of the monastic life into Rome and Italy, is occasionally mentioned by Jerom (i. p. 119, 120. 199.).

[5] Life of Hilarion, by St. Jerom (i. p. 241. 252.). The stories of Paul, Hilarion, and Malchus, by the same author, are admirably told; and the only defect of these pleasing compositions is the want of truth and common sense.

[6] His original retreat was in a small village on the banks of the Iris, not far from Neo-Cæsarea. The ten or twelve years of his monastic life were disturbed by long and frequent avocations. Some critics have disputed the authenticity of his Ascetic rules; but the external evidence is weighty, and they can only prove, that it is the work of a real or affected enthusiast. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. ix. p. 636—644. Helyot, Hist. des Ordres Monastiques, . p. 175—181.

[7] Life, and the Three Dialogues by Sulpicius Severus, who asserts (Dialog. i. 16.), that th booksellers of Rome were delighted with the quick and ready sale of his popular work.

deserts of Thebais, to produce, in a more favourable climate, a champion of equal virtue. The progress of the monks was not less rapid, or universal, than that of Christianity itself. Every province, and, at last, every city, of the empire, was filled with their increasing multitudes; and the bleak and barren isles, from Lerins to Lipari, that arise out of the Tuscan sea, were chosen by the anachorets, for the place of their voluntary exile. An easy and perpetual intercourse by sea and land connected the provinces of the Roman world; and the life of Hilarion displays the facility with which an indigent hermit of Palestine might traverse Egypt, embark for Sicily, escape to Epirus, and finally settle in the island of Cyprus.[1] The Latin Christians embraced the religious institutions of Rome. The pilgrims, who visited Jerusalem, eagerly copied, in the most distant climates of the earth, the faithful model of the monastic life. The disciples of Antony spread themselves beyond the tropic over the Christian empire of Æthiopia.[2] The monastery of Banchor[3] in Flintshire, which contained above two thousand brethren, dispersed a numerous colony among the Barbarians of Ireland;[4] and Iona, one of the Hebrides, which was planted by the Irish monks, diffused over the northern regions a doubtful ray of science and superstition.[5]

These unhappy exiles from social life, were impelled by the dark and implacable genius of superstition. Their mutual resolution was supported by the example of millions, of either sex, of every age, and of every rank; and each proselyte, who entered the gates of a monastery, was persuaded, that he trod the steep and thorny path of eternal happiness.[6] But the operation of these religious motives was variously determined by the temper and situation of mankind. Reason might subdue, or passion might suspend, their influence: but they acted most forcibly on the infirm minds of children and females; they were strengthened by secret remorse, or accidental misfortune; and they might derive some aid from the temporal considerations of vanity or interest. It was naturally supposed, that the pious and humble

[1] When Hilarion sailed from Paraetonium to Cape Pachynus, he offered to pay his passage with a book of the Gospels. Posthumian, a Gallic monk, who had visited Egypt, found a merchant-ship bound from Alexandria to Marseilles, and performed the voyage in thirty days (Sulp. Sever. Dialog. i. 1.). Athanasius, who addressed his Life of St. Anthony to the foreign monks, was obliged to hasten the composition, that it might be ready for the sailing of the fleets (ii. p. 451.).

[2] Jerom (i. p. 126.), Assemanni, Bibliot. Orient. tom. iv. p. 92. p. 857—919. and Geddes, Church Hist. of Æthiop. p. 29, 30, 31. The Abyssinian monks adhere very strictly to the primitive institution.

[3] Cambden's Britannia, vol. i. p. 666, 667.

[4] All that learning can extract from the rubbish of the dark ages is copiously stated by archbishop Usher, in his Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates, cap. xvi. p. 425—503.

[5] This small, though not barren spot, Iona, Hy, or Columbkill, only two miles in length, and one mile in breadth, has been distinguished, 1. By the monastery of St. Columba, founded A.D. 566; whose abbot exercised an extraordinary jurisdiction over the bishops of Caledonia. 2. By a *classic* library, which afforded some hopes of an entire Livy; and, 3. By the tombs of sixty kings, Scots, Irish, and Norwegians; who reposed in holy ground. See Usher (p. 311. 360—370.), and Buchanan (Rer. Scot. l. ii. p. 15. edit. Ruddiman).

[6] Chrysostom (in the first tome of the Benedictine edition) has consecrated three books to the praise and defence of the monastic life. He is encouraged by the example of the ark, to presume, that none but the elect (the monks) can possibly be saved (l. i. p. 55, 56.). Elsewhere indeed he becomes more merciful (l. iii. p. 83, 84.), and allows different degrees of glory like the sun, moon, and stars. In this lively comparison of a king and a monk (l. iii. p. 116—121.), he supposes (what is hardly fair) that the king will be more sparingly rewarded, and more rigorously punished.

monks, who had renounced the world, to accomplish the work of their salvation, were the best qualified for the spiritual government of the Christians. The reluctant hermit was torn from his cell, and seated, amidst the acclamations of the people, on the episcopal throne: the monasteries of Egypt, of Gaul, and of the East, supplied a regular succession of saints and bishops; and ambition soon discovered the secret road which led to the possession of wealth and honours.[1] The popular monks, whose reputation was connected with the fame and success of the order, assiduously laboured to multiply the number of their fellow-captives. They insinuated themselves into noble and opulent families; and the specious arts of flattery and seduction were employed to secure those proselytes, who might bestow wealth or dignity on the monastic profession. The indignant father bewailed the loss, perhaps, of an only son;[2] the credulous maid was betrayed by vanity to violate the laws of nature; and the matron aspired to imaginary perfection, by renouncing the virtues of domestic life. Paula yielded to the persuasive eloquence of Jerom;[3] and the profane title of mother-in-law of God,[4] tempted that illustrious widow, to consecrate the virginity of her daughter Eustochium. By the advice, and in the company, of her spiritual guide, Paula abandoned Rome and her infant son; retired to the holy village of Bethlem; founded an hospital and four monasteries; and acquired, by her alms and penance, an eminent and conspicuous station in the Catholic church. Such rare and illustrious penitents were celebrated as the glory and example of their age; but the monasteries were filled by a crowd of obscure and abject plebeians,[5] who gained in the cloister much more than they had sacrificed in the world. Peasants, slaves, and mechanics, might escape from poverty and contempt, to a safe and honourable profession; whose apparent hardships were mitigated by custom, by popular applause, and by the secret relaxation of discipline.[6] The subjects of Rome, whose persons and fortunes were made responsible for unequal and exorbitant tributes, retired from the oppression of the Imperial government; and the pusillanimous youth preferred the penance of a monastic, to the dangers of a military, life. The affrighted provincials, of every rank, who fled before the Barbarians, found

[1] Thomassin (Discip. de l'Eglise, i. p. 1426—1469.), and Mabillon (Oeuvres Posthumes, ii. p. 115—158.). The monks were gradually adopted as a part of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

[2] Dr. Middleton (i. p. 110.) liberally censures the conduct and writings of Chrysostom, one of the most eloquent and successful advocates for the monastic life.

[3] Jerom's devout ladies form a very considerable portion of his works: the particular treatise, which he styles the Epitaph of Paula (i. p. 169—192.), is an elaborate and extravagant panegyric. The exordium is ridiculously turgid: "If all the members of my body were "changed into tongues, and if all my limbs resounded with a human voice, yet I should be "incapable," &c.

[4] Socrus Dei esse cœpisti (Jerom, i. p. 140. ad Eustochium). Rufinus (in Hieronym. Op. iv. p. 223.), who was justly scandalized, asks his adversary, From what Pagan poet he had stolen an expression so impious and absurd?

[5] Nunc autem veniunt *plerumque* ad hanc professionem servitutis Dei, et ex conditione servili, vel etiam liberati, vel propter hoc a Dominis liberati sive liberandi; et ex vitâ rusticanâ, et ex opificum exercitatione, et plebeio labore. August. de Oper. Monach. c. 22. ap. Thomassin. Discip. de l'Eglise, iii. p. 1094. The Egyptian, who blamed Arsenius, owned that he led a more comfortable life as a monk than as a shepherd. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. xiv. p. 679.

[6] A Dominican friar (Voy. du P. Labat, i. p. 10.), who lodged at Cadiz in a convent of his brethren, soon understood, that their repose was never interrupted by nocturnal devotion "quoiqu'on ne laisse pas de sonner pour l'edification du peuple."

shelter and subsistence; whose legions were buried in these religious sanctuaries; and the same cause, which relieved the distress of individuals, impaired the strength and fortitude of the empire.[1]

The monastic profession of the ancients wa an act of voluntary devotion. The inconstant fanatic was threatened with the eternal vengeance of the God whom he deserted: but the doors of the monastery were still open for repentance. Those monks, whose conscience was fortified by reason or passion, were at liberty to resume the character of men and citizens; and even the spouses of Christ might accept the legal embraces of an earthly lover.[3] The examples of scandal, and the progress of superstition, suggested the propriety of more forcible restraints. After a sufficient trial, the fidelity of the novice was secured by a solemn and perpetual vow; and his irrevocable engagement was ratified by the laws of the church and state. A guilty fugitive was pursued, arrested, and restored to his perpetual prison; and the interposition of the magistrate oppressed the freedom and merit, which had alleviated, in some degree, the abject slavery of the monastic discipline.[4] The actions of a monk, his words, and even his thoughts, were determined by an inflexible rule,[5] or a capricious superior: the slightest offences were corrected by disgrace or confinement, extraordinary fasts or bloody flagellation; and disobedience, murmur, or delay, were ranked in the catalogue of the most heinous sins.[6] A blind submission to the commands of the abbot, however absurd, or even criminal, they might seem, was the ruling principle, the first virtue of the Egyptian monks; and their patience was frequently exercised by the most extravagant trials. They were directed to remove an enormous rock; assiduously to water a barren staff, that was planted in the ground, till, at the end of three years, it should vegetate and blossom like a tree; to walk into a fiery furnace; or to cast their infant into a deep pond: and several saints, or madmen, have been immortalized in monastic story, by their thoughtless, and

[1] See a very sensible preface of Lucas Holstenius to the Codex Regularum. The emperors attempted to support the obligation of public and private duties; but the feeble dykes were swept away by the torrent of superstition: and Justinian surpassed the most sanguine wishes of the monks (Thomassin, i. p. 1782—1799. and Bingham, l. vii. c. 3. p. 253.).

[2] The monastic institutions, particularly those of Egypt, about the year 400, are described by four curious and devout travellers; Rufinus (Vit. Patrum, l. ii, iii. p. 424—536.) Posthumian (Sulp. Sever. Dialog. i.), Palladius (Hist. Lausiac. in Vit. Patrum, p. 709—863.), and Cassian (vii. Bibliothec. Max. Patrum, his four first books of Institutes, and the twenty-four Collations or Conferences.).

[3] The example of Malchus (Jerom, i. p. 256.), and the design of Cassian and his friend (Collation xxiv. 1.) are incontestable proofs of their freedom; which is elegantly described by Erasmus in his Life of St. Jerom. Chardon, Hist. des Sacremens, vi. p. 279—300.

[4] Laws of Justinian (Novel. cxxiii. No. 42.), and of Lewis the Pious (in the historians of France, vi. p. 427.), and the actual jurisprudence of France, in Denissart (Decisions, &c. iv. p. 855, &c.).

[5] The ancient Codex Regularum, collected by Benedict Anianinus, the reformer of the monks in the beginning of the ninth century, and published in the seventeenth, by Lucas Holstenius, contains thirty different rules for men and women. Of these, seven were composed in Egypt, one in the East, one in Cappadocia, one in Italy, one in Africa, four in Spain, eight in Gaul, or France, and one in England.

[6] The rule of Columbanus, so prevalent in the West, inflicts one hundred lashes for very slight offences (Cod. Reg. part ii. p. 174.). Before the time of Charlemagne, the abbots indulged themselves in mutilating their monks, or putting out their eyes; a punishment much less cruel than the tremendous *vade in pace* (the subterranean dungeon, or sepulchre), which was afterwards invented. See an admirable discourse of the learned Mabillon (Oeuv. Posthum. ii. p. 321—336.); who, on this occasion, seems to be inspired by the genius of humanity. For such an effort, I can forgive his defence of the holy tear of Vendome (p. 361—399.).

fearless obedience.[1] The freedom of the mind, the source of every generous and rational sentiment, was destroyed by the habits of credulity and submission; and the monk, contracting the vices of a slave, devoutly followed the faith and passions of his ecclesiastical tyrant. The peace of the Eastern church was invaded by a swarm of fanatics, incapable of fear, or reason, or humanity; and the Imperial troops acknowledged, without shame, that they were much less apprehensive of an encounter with the fiercest Barbarians.[2]

Superstition has often framed and consecrated the fantastic garments of the monks:[3] but their apparent singularity sometimes proceeds from their uniform attachment to a simple and primitive model, which the revolutions of fashion have made ridiculous in the eyes of mankind. The father of the Benedictines expressly disclaims all idea of choice, or merit; and soberly exhorts his disciples to adopt the coarse and convenient dress of the countries which they may inhabit.[4] The monastic habits of the ancients varied with the climate, and their mode of life; and they assumed, with the same indifference, the sheepskin of the Egyptian peasants, or the cloak of the Grecian philosophers. They allowed themselves the use of linen in Egypt, where it was a cheap and domestic manufacture; but in the West, they rejected such an expensive article of foreign luxury.[5] It was the practice of the monks either to cut or shave their hair; they wrapped their heads in a cowl, to escape the sight of profane objects; their legs and feet were naked, except in the extreme cold of winter; and their slow and feeble steps were supported by a long staff. The aspect of a genuine anachoret was horrid and disgusting: every sensation that is offensive to man, was thought acceptable to God; and the angelic rule of Tabenne condemned the salutary custom of bathing the limbs in water, and of anointing them with oil.[6] The austere monks slept on the ground, on a hard mat, or a rough blanket; and the same bundle of palm-leaves served them as a seat in the day, and a pillow in the night. Their original cells were low narrow huts, built of the slightest materials; which formed, by the regular distribution of the streets, a large and populous village, inclosing within the common wall, a church, an hospital, perhaps a library, some necessary offices, a garden, and a fountain or reservoir of fresh water. Thirty or forty brethren composed a family of separate discipline and diet; and the great monasteries of Egypt consisted of thirty or forty families.

Pleasure and guilt are synonymous terms in the language of the

[1] Sulp. Sever. Dialog. i. 12, 13. p. 532, &c. Cassian. Institut. l. iv. c. 26, 27. "Præcipua "ibi virtus et prima est obedientia." Among the verba seniorum (in Vit. Patrum, l. v. p. 617.), the fourteenth libel or discourse is on the subject of obedience; and the Jesuit Rosweyde, who published that huge volume for the use of convents, has collected all the scattered passages in his two copious indexes.

[2] Jortin (Remarks on Eccles. Hist. iv. p. 161.) has observed the scandalous valour of the Cappadocian monks, which was exemplified in the banishment of Chrysostom.

[3] Cassian has simply, though copiously, described the monastic habit of Egypt (Institut. l. .), to which Soz. (l. iii. c. 14.) attributes such allegorical meaning and virtue.

[4] Regul. Benedict. No. 55. in Cod. Regul. part ii. p. 51.

[5] Rule of Ferreolus, bishop of Ufez (No. 31. in Cod. Regul. part ii. p. 136.), and of Isidore, bishop of Seville (No. 13. in Cod. Regul. part ii. p. 214.).

[6] Some partial indulgences were granted for the hands and feet. "Totum autem corpus "nemo unguet nisi causâ infirmitatis, nec lavabitur aquâ nudo corpore, nisi languor perspicuus "sit" (Regul. Pachom. xcii. part i. p. 78.).

monks: and they had discovered, by experience, that rigid fasts, and abstemious diet, are the most effectual preservatives against the impure desires of the flesh.[1] The rules of abstinence, which they imposed, or practised, were not uniform or perpetual: the cheerful festival of the Pentecost was balanced by the extraordinary mortification of Lent; the fervour of new monasteries was insensibly relaxed; and the voracious appetite of the Gauls could not imitate the patient, and temperate, virtue of the Egyptians.[2] The disciples of Antony and Pachomius were satisfied with their daily pittance,[3] of twelve ounces of bread, or rather biscuit,[4] which they divided into two frugal repasts, of the afternoon, and of the evening. It was esteemed a merit, and almost a duty, to abstain from the boiled vegetables, which were provided for the refectory; but the extraordinary bounty of the abbot sometimes indulged them with the luxury of cheese, fruit, salad, and the small dried fish of the Nile.[5] A more ample latitude of sea and river fish was gradually allowed or assumed: but the use of flesh was long confined to the sick or travellers; and when it gradually prevailed in the less rigid monasteries of Europe, a singular distinction was introduced; as if birds, whether wild or domestic, had been less profane than the grosser animals of the field. Water was the pure and innocent beverage of the primitive monks; and the founder of the Benedictines regrets the daily portion of half a pint of wine, which had been extorted from him by the intemperance of the age.[6] Such an allowance might be easily supplied by the vineyards of Italy; and his victorious disciples, who passed the Alps, the Rhine, and the Baltic, required, in the place of wine, an adequate compensation of strong beer or cyder.

The candidate who aspired to the virtue of evangelical poverty, abjured, at his first entrance into a regular community, the idea, and even the name, of all separate, or exclusive, possession.[7] The brethren

[1] St. Jerom, in strong, but indiscreet, language, expresses the most important use of fasting and abstinence: "Non quod Deus universitatis Creator et Dominus, intestinorum nostrorum "rugitû, et inanitate ventris, pulmonisque ardore delectetur, sed quod aliter pudicitia tuta "esse non possit." (Op. i. p. 137. ad Eustochium.) See the twelfth and twenty-second Collations of Cassian, *de Castitate*, and *de Illusionibus Nocturnis*.

[2] Edacitas in Græcis gula est, in Gallas natura (Dialog. i. c. 4. p. 521.). Cassian fairly owns, that the perfect model of abstinence cannot be imitated in Gaul, on account of the aerum temperies, and the qualitas nostræ fragilitatis (Institut. iv. 11.). Among the Western rules, that of Columbanus is the most austere; he had been educated amidst the poverty of Ireland, as rigid perhaps, and inflexible, as the abstemious virtue of Egypt. The rule of Isidore of Seville is the mildest; on holidays he allows the use of flesh.

[3] "Those who drink only water, and have no nutritious liquor, ought, at least, to have a "pound and a half (*twenty-four ounces*) of bread every day." State of Prisons, p. 40. by Mr. Howard.

[4] Cassian. Collat. l. ii. 19, 20, 21. The small loaves, or biscuit, of six ounces each, had obtained the name of *Paximacia* (Rosweyde, Onomasticon, p. 1045.). Pachomius, however, allowed his monks some latitude in the quantity of their food; but he made them work in proportion as they eat (Pallad. in Hist. Lausiac. c. 38, 39. in Vit. Patrum, l. viii. p. 736, 737.).

[5] See the banquet to which Cassian (Collation viii. 1.) was invited by Serenus, an Egyptian abbot.

[6] Rule of St. Benedict, No. 39, 40. (in Cod. Reg. part ii. p. 41, 42.). Licet legamus vinum omnino monachorum non esse, sed quia nostris temporibus id monachis persuaderi non potest; he allows them a Roman *hemina*, a measure which may be ascertained from Arbuthnot's Tables.

[7] Such expressions, as *my* book, *my* cloak, *my* shoes (Cassian. Institut. l. iv. c. 13.), were not less severely prohibited among the Western monks (Cod. Regul. part ii. p. 174. 235. 288.); and the Rule of Columbanus punished them with six lashes. The ironical author of the *Ordres Monastiques*, who laughs at the foolish nicety of modern convents, seems ignorant that the ancients were equally absurd.

were supported by their manual labour; and the duty of labour was strenuously recommended as a penance, as an exercise, and as the most laudable means of securing their daily subsistence.[1] The garden, and fields, which the industry of the monks had often rescued from the forest or the morass, were diligently cultivated by their hands. They performed, without reluctance, the menial offices of slaves and domestics; and the several trades that were necessary to provide their habits, their utensils, and their lodging, were exercised within the precincts of the great monasteries. The monastic studies have tended, for the most part, to darken, rather than to dispel, the cloud of superstition. Yet the curiosity or zeal of some learned solitaries has cultivated the ecclesiastical, and even the profane, sciences: and posterity must gratefully acknowledge, that the monuments of Greek and Roman literature have been preserved and multiplied by their indefatigable pens.[2] But the more humble industry of the monks, especially in Egypt, was contented with the silent, sedentary occupation, of making wooden sandals, or of twisting the leaves of the palm-tree into mats and baskets. The superfluous stock, which was not consumed in domestic use, supplied, by trade, the wants of the community: the boats of Tabenne, and the other monasteries of Thebais, descended the Nile as far as Alexandria; and, in a Christian market, the sanctity of the workmen might enhance the intrinsic value of the work.

But the necessity of manual labour was insensibly superseded. The novice was tempted to bestow his fortune on the saints, in whose society he was resolved to spend the remainder of his life; and the pernicious indulgence of the laws permitted him to receive, for their use, any future accessions of legacy or inheritance.[3] Melania contributed her plate, 300 pounds weight of silver; and Paula contracted an immense debt, for the relief of their favourite monks; who kindly imparted the merits of their prayers and penance to a rich and liberal sinner.[4] Time continually increased, and accidents could seldom diminish, the estates of the popular monasteries, which spread over the adjacent country and cities: and, in the first century of their institution, the infidel Zosimus has maliciously observed, that, for the benefit of the poor, the Christian monks had reduced a great part of mankind to a state of beggary.[5] As long as they maintained their

[1] Two great masters of ecclesiastical science, the P. Thomassin (Discip. de l'Eglise, iii. p. 1090—1139.), and the P. Mabillon (Etudes Monastiques, i. p. 116—155.), have seriously examined the manual labour of the monks, which the former considers as a *merit*, and the latter as a *duty*.

[2] Mabil. (Etud. Monastiq. i. 47.) has collected many curious facts to justify the literary labours of his predecessors, both in the East and West. Books were copied in the ancient monasteries of Egypt (Cassian. Institut. l. iv. c. 12.), and by the disciples of St. Martin (Sulp. Sever. in Vit. Martin. c. 7. p. 473.). Cassiodorus has allowed an ample scope for the studies of the monks: and *we* shall not be scandalized, if their pen sometimes wandered from Chrysostom and Augustin, to Homer and Virgil.

[3] Thomassin (Discip. de l'Eglise, iii. 118. 145. 171.) has examined the revolution of the civil, canon, and common law. Modern France confirms the death which monks have inflicted on themselves, and justly deprives them of all right of inheritance.

[4] Jerom (i. p. 176. 183.). The monk Pambo made a sublime answer to Melania, who wished to specify the value of her gift; "Do you offer it to me, or to God? If to God, HE who suspends the mountains in a balance, need not be informed of the weight of your plate." (Pallad. Hist. Lausiac. c. 10. in the Vit. Patrum, l. viii. p. 715.)

[5] *Το πολυ μερος της γης ωκειωσαντο, προφασει των μεταδιδοναι παντα πτωχοις, παντας (ως ειπειν) πτωχους καταστησαντες.* Zosim. l. v. p. 325. Yet the wealth of the Eastern monks was far surpassed by the princely greatness of the Benedictines.

original fervour, they approved themselves, however, the faithful and benevolent stewards of the charity, which was entrusted to their care. But their discipline was corrupted by prosperity: they gradually assumed the pride of wealth, and at last indulged the luxury of expence. Their public luxury might be excused by the magnificence of religious worship, and the decent motive of erecting durable habitations for an immortal society. But every age of the church has accused the licentiousness of the degenerate monks; who no longer remembered the object of their institution, embraced the vain and sensual pleasures of the world, which they had renounced,[1] and scandalously abused the riches which had been acquired by the austere virtues of their founders.[2] Their natural descent, from such painful and dangerous virtue, to the common vices of humanity, will not, perhaps, excite much grief or indignation in the mind of a philosopher.

The lives of the primitive monks were consumed in penance and solitude; undisturbed by the various occupations which fill the time, and exercise the faculties, of reasonable, active, and social beings. Whenever they were permitted to step beyond the precincts of the monastery, two jealous companions were the mutual guards and spies of each other's actions; and, after their return, they were condemned to forget, or, at least, to suppress, whatever they had seen or heard in the world. Strangers, who professed the orthodox faith, were hospitably entertained in a separate apartment; but their dangerous conversation was restricted to some chosen elders of approved discretion and fidelity. Except in their presence, the monastic slave might not receive the visits of his friends or kindred; and it was deemed highly meritorious, if he afflicted a tender sister, or an aged parent, by the obstinate refusal of a word or look.[3] The monks themselves passed their lives, without personal attachments, among a crowd, which had been formed by accident, and was detained, in the same prison, by force or prejudice. Recluse fanatics have few ideas or sentiments to communicate: a special license of the abbot regulated the time and duration of their familiar visits; and, at their silent meals, they were enveloped in their cowls inaccessible, and almost invisible, to each other.[4] Study is the resource of solitude: but education had not prepared and qualified for any liberal studies the mechanics and peasants, who filled the monastic communities. They might work: but the vanity of spiritual perfection was tempted to disdain the exercise of manual labour; and the industry must be faint and languid, which is not excited by the sense of personal interest.

[1] The sixth general council (the Quinisext in Trullo, Canon xlvii. in Beveridge, i. p. 213.) restrains women from passing the night in a male, or men in a female, monastery. The seventh general council (the second Nicene, Canon xx. in Beveridge, i. p. 325.) prohibits the erection of double or promiscuous monasteries of both sexes; but it appears from Balsamon, that the prohibition was not effectual. On the irregular pleasures and expences of the clergy and *monks*, see Thomassin, iii. p. 1334—1368.

[2] I have somewhere heard or read the frank confession of a Benedictine abbot: "My vow "of poverty has given me an hundred thousand crowns a year; my vow of obedience has 'raised me to the rank of a sovereign prince."—I forget the consequences of his vow of chastity.

[3] Pior, an Egyptian monk, allowed his sister to see him; but he shut his eyes during the whole visit. Vit. Patrum, l. iii. p. 504. Many such examples might be added.

[4] The 7th, 8th, 29th, 30th, 31st, 34th, 57th, 60th, 86th, and 95th articles of the Rule of Pachomius, impose most intolerable *laws* of silence and mortification.

According to their faith and zeal, they might employ the day, which they passed in their cells, either in vocal or mental prayer: they assembled in the evening, and they were awakened in the night, for the public worship of the monastery. The precise moment was determined by the stars, which are seldom clouded in the serene sky of Egypt; and a rustic horn, or trumpet, the signal of devotion, twice interrupted the vast silence of the desert.[1] Even sleep, the last refuge of the unhappy, was rigorously measured: the vacant hours of the monk heavily rolled along, without business or pleasure; and, before the close of each day, he had repeatedly accused the tedious progress of the Sun.[2] In this comfortless state, superstition still pursued and tormented her wretched votaries.[3] The repose which they had sought in the cloister was disturbed by tardy repentance, profane doubts, and guilty desires; and, while they considered each natural impulse as an unpardonable sin, they perpetually trembled on the edge of a flaming and bottomless abyss. From the painful struggles of disease and despair, these unhappy victims were sometimes relieved by madness, or death; and, in the sixth century, an hospital was founded at Jerusalem for a small portion of the austere penitents, who were deprived of their senses.[4] Their visions, before they attained this extreme and acknowledged term of frenzy, have afforded ample materials of supernatural history. It was their firm persuasion, that the air, which they breathed, was peopled with invisible enemies; with innumerable dæmons, who watched every occasion, and assumed every form, to terrify, and above all to tempt, their unguarded virtue. The imagination, and even the senses, were deceived by the illusions of distempered fanaticism; and the hermit, whose midnight prayer was oppressed by involuntary slumber, might easily confound the phantoms of horror or delight, which had occupied his sleeping, and his waking dreams.[5]

The monks were divided into two classes: the *Cœnobites*, who lived under a common, and regular, discipline; and the *Anachorets*, who indulged their unsocial, independent, fanaticism.[6] The most devout, or the most ambitious, of the spiritual brethren, renounced the convent, as they had renounced the world. The fervent monasteries of

[1] The diurnal and nocturnal prayers of the monks are copiously discussed by Cassian in the third and fourth books of his Institutions; and he constantly prefers the liturgy, which an angel had dictated to the monasteries of Tabenne.

[2] Cassian, from his own experience, describes the *acedia*, or listlessness of mind and body, to which a monk was exposed, when he sighed to find himself alone. Sæpiusque egreditur et ingreditur cellam, et Solem velut ad occasum tardius properantem crebrius intuetur (Institut. x. 1.).

[3] The temptations and sufferings of Stagirius were communicated by that unfortunate youth to his friend St. Chrysostom. Middleton's Works, i. p. 107—110. Something similar introduces the life of every saint; and the famous Inigo, or Ignatius, the founder of the Jesuits (Vie d'Inigo de Guiposcoa, i. 29.) may serve as a memorable example.

[4] Fleury, Hist. Eccles. vii. 46. I have read somewhere, in the Vitæ Patrum, but I cannot recover the place, that *several*, I believe *many*, of the monks, who did not reveal their temptations to the abbot, became guilty of suicide.

[5] Seventh and eighth Collations of Cassian, who gravely examines, why the dæmons were grown less active and numerous, since the time of St. Antony. Rosweyde's copious index to the Vitæ Patrum will point out a variety of infernal scenes. The devils were most formidable in a female shape.

[6] For the distinction of the *Cœnobites* and the *Hermits*, especially in Egypt, see Jerom (i. 45. ad Rusticum), the first Dialogue of Sulpicius Severus, Rufinus (c. 22. in Vit. Patrum, l. ii. 478.), Palladius (c. 7. 69. in Vit. Patrum, l. viii. p. 712. 758.), and above all, the eighteenth and nineteenth Collations of Cassian. These writers, who compare the common and solitary life, reveal the abuse and danger of the latter.

Egypt, Palestine, and Syria, were surrounded by a *Laura*,[1] a distant circle of solitary cells; and the extravagant penance of the Hermits was stimulated by applause and emulation.[2] They sunk under the painful weight of crosses and chains; and their emaciated limbs were confined by collars, bracelets, gauntlets, and greaves, of massy, and rigid, iron. All superfluous incumbrance of dress they contemptuously cast away; and some savage saints of both sexes have been admired, whose naked bodies were only covered by their long hair. They aspired to reduce themselves to the rude and miserable state in which the human brute is scarcely distinguished above his kindred animals: and a numerous sect of Anachorets derived their name from their humble practice of grazing in the fields of Mesopotamia with the common herd.[3] They often usurped the den of some wild beast whom they affected to resemble; they buried themselves in some gloomy cavern, which art or nature had scooped out of the rock; and the marble quarries of Thebais are still inscribed with the monuments of their penance.[4] The most perfect hermits are supposed to have passed many days without food, many nights without sleep, and many years without speaking; and glorious was the *man* (I abuse that name) who contrived any cell, or seat, of a peculiar construction, which might expose him, in the most inconvenient posture, to the inclemency of the seasons.

Among these heroes of the monastic life, the name and genius of Simeon Stylites[5] (A.D. 395—451) have been immortalized by the singular invention of an aerial penance. At the age of thirteen, the young Syrian deserted the profession of a shepherd, and threw himself into an austere monastery. After a long and painful noviciate, in which Simeon was repeatedly saved from pious suicide, he established his residence on a mountain, about thirty or forty miles to the East of Antioch. Within the space of a *mandra*, or circle of stones, to which he had attached himself by a ponderous chain, he ascended a column, which was successively raised from the height of nine, to that of sixty, feet from the ground.[6] In this last and lofty station, the Syrian Anachoret resisted the heat of thirty summers, and the cold of as many winters. Habit and exercise instructed him to maintain his dangerous situation without fear or giddiness, and successively to assume the different postures of devotion. He sometimes prayed in an erect attitude, with his outstretched arms, in the figure of a cross; but his most familiar practice was that of bending his meagre skeleton from the

[1] Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. ii. 205. Thomassin (Discipline de l'Eglise, i. p. 1501, 1502.) gives a good account of these cells. When Gerasimus founded his monastery, in the wilderness of Jordan, it was accompanied by a Laura of seventy cells.

[2] Theodoret, in a large volume (Philotheus in Vit. Patrum, l. ix. 793—863.) has collected the lives and miracles of thirty Anachorets. Evagrius (l. i. c. 12.) more briefly celebrates the monks and hermits of Palestine.

[3] Soz. l. vi. c. 33. The great St. Ephrem composed a panegyric on these βοσκοι, or grazing monks (Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. viii. 292.).

[4] The P. Sicard (Missions du Levant, ii. 217.) examined the caverns of the Lower Thebais, with wonder and devotion. The inscriptions are in the old Syriac character, which was used by the Christians of Abyssinia.

[5] Theodor. (Vit. Patrum, l. ix. 848.), Antony (Vit. Patrum, l. i. 170.), Cosmas (in Asseman. Bibliot. Oriental. i. 239.), Evag. (l. i. c. 13, 14.), and Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. xv. p. 347—392.)

[6] The narrow circumference of two cubits, or three feet, which Evagrius assigns for the summit of the column, is inconsistent with reason, with facts, and with the rules of architecture. The people who saw it from below might be easily deceived.

forehead to the feet: and a curious spectator, after numbering twelve hundred and forty-four repetitions, at length desisted from the endless account. The progress of an ulcer in his thigh[1] might shorten, but it could not disturb, this *celestial* life; and the patient Hermit expired, without descending from his column. A prince, who should capriciously inflict such tortures, would be deemed a tyrant; but it would surpass the power of a tyrant, to impose a long and miserable existence on the reluctant victims of his cruelty. This voluntary martyrdom must have gradually destroyed the sensibility both of the mind and body; nor can it be presumed that the fanatics, who torment themselves, are susceptible of any lively affection for the rest of mankind. A cruel unfeeling temper has distinguished the monks of every age and country: their stern indifference, which is seldom mollified by personal friendship, is inflamed by religious hatred; and their merciless zeal has strenuously administered the holy office of the Inquisition.

The monastic saints, who excite only the contempt and pity of a philosopher, were respected, and almost adored, by the prince and people. Successive crowds of pilgrims from Gaul and India saluted the divine pillar of Simeon: the tribes of Saracens disputed in arms the honour of his benediction; the queens of Arabia and Persia gratefully confessed his supernatural virtue; and the angelic Hermit was consulted by the younger Theodosius, in the most important concerns of the church and state. His remains were transported from the mountain of Telenissa, by a solemn procession of the patriarch, the master-general of the East, six bishops, twenty-one counts or tribunes, and six thousand soldiers; and Antioch revered his bones, as her glorious ornament and impregnable defence. The fame of the apostles and martyrs was gradually eclipsed by these recent and popular Anachorets; the Christian world fell prostrate before their shrines; and the miracles ascribed to their relics exceeded, at least in number and duration, the spiritual exploits of their lives. But the golden legend of their lives[2] was embellished by the artful credulity of their interested brethren; and a believing age was easily persuaded, that the slightest caprice of an Egyptian or a Syrian monk had been sufficient to interrupt the eternal laws of the universe. The favourites of Heaven were accustomed to cure inveterate diseases with a touch, a word, or a distant message; and to expel the most obstinate dæmons from the souls, or bodies, which they possessed. They familiarly accosted, or imperiously commanded, the lions and serpents of the desert; infused vegetation into a sapless trunk; suspended iron on the surface of the water; passed the Nile on the back of a crocodile, and refreshed themselves in a fiery furnace. These extravagant tales, which display the fiction, without the genius, of poetry, have seriously affected the reason, the faith, and the morals of the Christians.

[1] I must not conceal a piece of ancient scandal concerning the origin of this ulcer. It has been reported that the Devil, assuming an angelic form, invited him to ascend, like Elijah, into a fiery chariot. The saint too hastily raised his foot, and Satan seized the moment of inflicting this chastisement on his vanity.

[2] I know not how to select or specify the miracles contained in the *Vitæ Patrum* of Rosweyde, as the number very much exceeds the thousand pages of that voluminous work. An elegant specimen may be found in the Dialogues of Sulpicius Severus, and his Life of St. Martin. He reveres the monks of Egypt; yet he insults them with the remark, that *they* never raised the dead; whereas the bishop of Tours had restored *three* dead men to life.

Their credulity debased and vitiated the faculties of the mind; they corrupted the evidence of history; and superstition gradually extinguished the hostile light of philosophy and science. Every mode of religious worship which had been practised by the saints, every mysterious doctrine which they believed, was fortified by the sanction of divine revelation, and all the manly virtues were oppressed by the servile and pusillanimous reign of the monks. If it be possible to measure the interval between the philosophic writings of Cicero and the sacred legend of Theodoret, between the character of Cato and that of Simeon, we may appreciate the memorable revolution which was accomplished in the Roman empire within a period of five hundred years.

II. The progress of Christianity has been marked by two glorious and decisive victories: over the learned and luxurious citizens of the Roman empire; and over the warlike Barbarians of Scythia and Germany, who subverted the empire, and embraced the religion, of the Romans. The Goths were the foremost of these savage proselytes; and the nation was indebted for its conversion to a countryman, or, at least, to a subject, worthy to be ranked among the inventors of useful arts, who have deserved the remembrance and gratitude of posterity. A great number of Roman provincials had been led away into captivity by the Gothic bands, who ravaged Asia in the time of Gallienus: and of these captives, many were Christians, and several belonged to the ecclesiastical order. Those involuntary missionaries, dispersed as slaves in the villages of Dacia, successively laboured for the salvation of their masters. The seeds, which they planted of the evangelic doctrine, were gradually propagated; and, before the end of a century, the pious work was achieved by the labours of Ulphilas, whose ancestors had been transported beyond the Danube from a small town of Cappadocia.

Ulphilas (A.D. 360, &c.), the bishop and apostle of the Goths,[1] acquired their love and reverence by his blameless life, and indefatigable zeal; and they received, with implicit confidence, the doctrines of truth and virtue, which he preached and practised. He executed the arduous task of translating the Scriptures into their native tongue, a dialect of the German or Teutonic language: but he prudently suppressed the four books of Kings, as they might tend to irritate the fierce and sanguinary spirit of the Barbarians. The rude, imperfect idiom of soldiers and shepherds, so ill-qualified to communicate any spiritual ideas, was improved and modulated by his genius; and Ulphilas, before he could frame his version, was obliged to compose a new alphabet of twenty-four letters; four of which he invented, to express the peculiar sounds that were unknown to the Greek, and Latin, pronunciation.[2] But the prosperous state of the Gothic church was soon afflicted by war and intestine discord, and the chieftains

[1] On the subject of Ulphilas, and the conversion of the Goths, see Soz. l. vi. c. 37., Socr. l. iv. c. 33., Theodor. l. iv. c. 37., Philostorg. l. ii. c. 5. The heresy of Philostorgius appears to have given him superior means of information.

[2] A mutilated copy of the four Gospels, in the Gothic version, was published A.D. 1665. and is esteemed the most ancient monument of the Teutonic language, though Wetstein attempts, by some frivolous conjectures, to deprive Ulphilas of the honour of the work. Two of the four additional letters express the *W*, and our own *Th*. Simon. Hist. Critique du Nouveau Testament, ii. 219. Mill. Prolegom. p. 151. ed. Kuster. Wetstein, Prolegom. i. 114.

were divided by religion as well as by interest. Fritigern, the friend of the Romans, became the proselyte of Ulphilas; while the haughty soul of Athanaric disdained the yoke of the empire, and of the Gospel. The faith of the new converts was tried by the persecution which he excited. A waggon, bearing aloft the shapeless image of Thor, perhaps, or of Woden, was conducted in solemn procession through the streets of the camp; and the rebels, who refused to worship the God of their fathers, were immediately burnt, with their tents and families. The character of Ulphilas recommended him to the esteem of the Eastern court, where he twice appeared as the minister of peace; he pleaded the cause of the distressed Goths, who implored the protection of Valens; and the name of *Moses* was applied to this spiritual guide, who conducted his people, through the deep waters of the Danube, to the Land of Promise.[1] The devout shepherds, who were attached to his person, and tractable to his voice, acquiesced in their settlement, at the foot of the Mæsian mountains, in a country of woodlands and pastures, which supported their flocks and herds, and enabled them to purchase the corn and wine of the more plentiful provinces. These harmless Barbarians multiplied in obscure peace, and the profession of Christianity.[2]

Their fiercer brethren, the formidable Visigoths (A.D. 400, &c.), universally adopted the religion of the Romans, with whom they maintained a perpetual intercourse, of war, of friendship, or of conquest. In their long and victorious march from the Danube to the Atlantic ocean, they converted their allies; they educated the rising generation; and the devotion which reigned in the camp of Alaric, or the court of Thoulouse, might edify, or disgrace, the palaces of Rome and Constantinople.[3] During the same period, Christianity was embraced by almost all the Barbarians, who established their kingdoms on the ruins of the Western empire; the Burgundians in Gaul, the Suevi in Spain, the Vandals in Africa, the Ostrogoths in Pannonia, and the various bands of Mercenaries, that raised Odoacer to the throne of Italy. The Franks and the Saxons still persevered in the errors of Paganism; but the Franks obtained the monarchy of Gaul by their submission to the example of Clovis; and the Saxon conquerors of Britain were reclaimed from their savage superstition by the missionaries of Rome. These Barbarian proselytes displayed an ardent and successful zeal in the propagation of the faith. The Merovingian kings, and their successors, Charlemagne and the Othos, extended, by their laws and victories, the dominion of the cross. England produced the apostle of Germany; and the evangelic light was gradually diffused from the neighbourhood of the Rhine, to the nations of the Elbe the Vistula, and the Baltic.[4]

[1] Philostorgius erroneously places this passage under the reign of Constantine; but I am much inclined to believe that it preceded the great emigration.

[2] We are obliged to Jornan. (de Reb. Get. c. 51. p. 688.) for a short and lively picture of these lesser Goths. Gothi minores, populus immensus, cum suo Pontifice ipsoque primate Wulfila. The last words, if they are not tautology, imply some temporal jurisdiction.

[3] At non ita Gothi non ita Vandali; malis licet doctoribus instituti, meliores tamen etiam in hâc parte quam nostri. Salvian de Gubern. Dei, l. vii. p. 243.

[4] Mosheim has slightly sketched the progress of Christianity in the North, from the fourth to the fourteenth century. The subject would afford materials for an ecclesiastical, and even philosophical history.

The different motives which influenced the reason or the passions of the Barbarian converts, cannot easily be ascertained. They were often capricious and accidental; a dream, an omen, the report of a miracle, the example of some priest, or hero, the charms of a believing wife, and, above all, the fortunate event of a prayer, or vow, which, in a moment of danger, they had addressed to the God of the Christians.[1] The early prejudices of education were insensibly erased by the habits of frequent and familiar society; the moral precepts of the Gospel were protected by the extravagant virtues of the monks; and a spiritual theology was supported by the visible power of relics, and the pomp of religious worship. But the rational and ingenious mode of persuasion, which a Saxon bishop[2] suggested to a popular saint, might sometimes be employed by the missionaries, who laboured for the conversion of infidels. "Admit," says the sagacious disputant, "whatever they are pleased to assert of the fabulous, and carnal, genealogy of their gods and goddesses, who are propagated from each "other. From this principle deduce their imperfect nature, and human "infirmities, the assurance they were *born*, and the probability that "they will *die*. At what time, by what means, from what cause, were "the eldest of the gods or goddesses produced? Do they still con"tinue, or have they ceased, to propagate? If they have ceased, "summon your antagonists to declare the reason of this strange alter"ation. If they still continue, the number of the gods must become "infinite; and shall we not risk, by the indiscreet worship of some "impotent deity, to excite the resentment of his jealous superior? "The visible heavens and earth, the whole system of the universe, "which may be conceived by the mind, is it created or eternal? If "created, how, or where, could the gods themselves exist before the "creation? If eternal, how could they assume the empire of an inde"pendent and pre-existing world? Urge these arguments with temper "and moderation; insinuate, at seasonable intervals, the truth, and "beauty, of the Christian revelation; and endeavour to make the un"believers ashamed, without making them angry." This metaphysical reasoning, too refined perhaps for the Barbarians of Germany, was fortified by the grosser weight of authority and popular consent. The advantage of temporal prosperity had deserted the Pagan cause, and passed over to the service of Christianity. The Romans themselves, the most powerful and enlightened nation of the globe, had renounced their ancient superstition; and, if the ruin of their empire seemed to accuse the efficacy of the new faith, the disgrace was already retrieved by the conversion of the victorious Goths. The valiant and fortunate Barbarians, who subdued the provinces of the West, successively received, and reflected, the same edifying example. Before the age of Charlemagne, the Christian nations of Europe might exult in the exclusive possession of the temperate climates, of the fertile lands, which produced corn, wine, and oil; while the savage idolaters, and their

[1] To such a cause has Socrates (l. vii. c. 30.) ascribed the conversion of the Burgundians, whose Christian piety is celebrated by Orosius (l. vii. c. 19.).

[2] See an original and curious epistle from Daniel, the first bishop of Winchester (Beda, Hist. Eccles. Anglorum, l. v. c. 18. p. 203. edit. Smith), to St. Boniface, who preached the Gospel among the Savages of Hesse and Thuringia. Epistol. Bonifacii, lxvii. in the Maxima Bibliotheca Patrum, xiii. p. 93.

helpless idols, were confined to the extremities of the earth, the dark and frozen regions of the North.[1]

Christianity, which opened the gates of Heaven to the Barbarians, introduced an important change in their moral and political condition. They received, at the same time, the use of letters, so essential to a religion whose doctrines are contained in a sacred book, and while they studied the divine truth, their minds were insensibly enlarged by the distant view of history, of nature, of the arts, and of society. The version of the Scriptures into their native tongue, which had facilitated their conversion, must excite, among their clergy, some curiosity to read the original text, to understand the sacred liturgy of the church, and to examine, in the writings of the fathers, the chain of ecclesiastical tradition. These spiritual gifts were preserved in the Greek and Latin languages, which concealed the inestimable monuments of ancient learning. The immortal productions of Virgil, Cicero, and Livy, which were accessible to the Christian Barbarians, maintained a silent intercourse between the reign of Augustus, and the times of Clovis and Charlemagne. The emulation of mankind was encouraged by the remembrance of a more perfect state; and the flame of science was secretly kept alive, to warm and enlighten the mature age of the Western world. In the most corrupt state of Christianity, the Barbarians might learn justice from the *law*, and mercy from the *gospel*: and if the knowledge of their duty was insufficient to guide their actions, or to regulate their passions; they were sometimes restrained by conscience, and frequently punished by remorse. But the direct authority of religion was less effectual, than the holy communion which united them with their Christian brethren in spiritual friendship. The influence of these sentiments contributed to secure their fidelity in the service, or the alliance, of the Romans, to alleviate the horrors of war, to moderate the insolence of conquest, and to preserve, in the downfall of the empire, a permanent respect for the name and institutions of Rome. In the days of Paganism, the priests of Gaul and Germany reigned over the people, and controlled the jurisdiction of the magistrates; and the zealous proselytes transferred an equal, or more ample, measure of devout obedience, to the pontiffs of the Christian faith. The sacred character of the bishops was supported by their temporal possessions; they obtained an honourable seat in the legislative assemblies of soldiers and freemen; and it was their interest, as well as their duty, to mollify, by peaceful counsels, the fierce spirit of the Barbarians. The perpetual correspondence of the Latin clergy, the frequent pilgrimages to Rome and Jerusalem, and the growing authority of the Popes, cemented the union of the Christian republic: and gradually produced the similar manners, and common jurisprudence, which have distinguished, from the rest of mankind, the independent, and even hostile, nations of modern Europe.

But the operation of these causes was checked and retarded by the unfortunate accident, which infused a deadly poison into the cup of Salvation. Whatever might be the early sentiments of Ul-

[1] The sword of Charlemagne added weight to the argument; but when Daniel wrote this epistle (A.D. 723.), the Mahometans, who reigned from India to Spain, might have retorted it against the Christians.

philas, his connexions with the empire and the church were formed during the reign of Arianism. The apostle of the Goths subscribed the creed of Rimini; professed with freedom, and perhaps with sincerity, that the SON was not equal, or consubstantial, to the FATHER;[1] communicated these errors to the clergy and people; and infected the Barbaric world with an heresy,[2] which the great Theodosius proscribed and extinguished among the Romans. The temper and understanding of the new proselytes were not adapted to metaphysical subtleties; but they strenuously maintained, what they had piously received, as the pure and genuine doctrines of Christianity. The advantage of preaching and expounding the Scriptures in the Teutonic language, promoted the apostolic labours of Ulphilas, and his successors; and they ordained a competent number of bishops and presbyters, for the instruction of the kindred tribes. The Ostrogoths, the Burgundians, the Suevi, and the Vandals, who had listened to the eloquence of the Latin clergy,[3] preferred the more intelligible lessons of their domestic teachers; and Arianism was adopted as the national faith of the warlike converts, who were seated on the ruins of the Western empire. This irreconcilable difference of religion was a perpetual source of jealousy and hatred; and the reproach of *Barbarian* was embittered by the more odious epithet of *Heretic.* The heroes of the North, who had submitted, with some reluctance, to believe that all their ancestors were in hell;[4] were astonished and exasperated to learn, that they themselves had only changed the mode of their eternal condemnation. Instead of the smooth applause, which Christian kings are accustomed to expect from their loyal prelates, the orthodox bishops and their clergy were in a state of opposition to the Arian courts; and their indiscreet opposition frequently became criminal, and might sometimes be dangerous.[5] The pulpit, that safe and sacred organ of sedition, resounded with the names of Pharaoh and Holofernes;[6] the public discontent was inflamed by the hope or promise of a glorious deliverance; and the seditious saints were tempted to promote the accomplishment of their own predictions. Notwithstanding these provocations, the Catholics of Gaul, Spain, and Italy, enjoyed, under the reign of the Arians, the free, and peaceful, exercise of their religion. Their haughty masters respected the zeal of a

[1] The opinions of Ulphilas and the Goths inclined to Semi-Arianism, since they would not say that the Son was a *creature*, though they held communion with those who maintained that heresy. Their apostles represented the whole controversy as a question of trifling moment, which had been raised by the passions of the clergy. Theodor. l. iv. c. 37.

[2] The Arianism of the Goths has been imputed to the emperor Valens: "Itaque justo Dei "judicio ipsi eum vivum incenderunt, qui propter eum etiam mortui, vitio erroris arsuri sunt." Oros. l. vii. c. 33. p. 554. This cruel sentence is confirmed by Tillemont (Mem. Eccles. vi. p. 604—610.), who coolly observes, "un seul homme entraina dans l'enfer un nombre infini "de Septentrionaux, &c." Salvian (de Gubern. Dei, l. v. p. 150, 151.) pities and excuses their involuntary error.

[3] Orosius affirms, in the year 416 (l. vii. c. 41. p. 580.), that the churches of Christ (of the Catholics) were filled with Huns, Suevi, Vandals, Burgundians.

[4] Radbod, king of the Frisons, was so much scandalized by this rash declaration of a missionary, that he drew back his foot after he had entered the baptismal font. Fleury Hist. Eccles. ix. p. 167.

[5] The Epistles of Sidonius, bishop of Clermont, under the Visigoths, and of Avitus, bishop of Vienna, under the Burgundians, explain, sometimes in dark hints, the general dispositions of the Catholics. The history of Clovis and Theodoric will suggest some particular facts.

[6] Genseric confessed the resemblance, by the severity with which he punished such indiscreet allusions. Victor Vitensis, l. 7. p. 10.

numerous people, resolved to die at the foot of their altars; and the example of their devout constancy was admired and imitated by the Barbarians themselves. The conquerors evaded, however, the disgraceful reproach, or confession, of fear, by attributing their toleration to the liberal motives of reason and humanity; and while they affected the language, they imperceptibly imbibed the spirit, of genuine Christianity.

The peace of the church was sometimes interrupted. The Catholics were indiscreet, the Barbarians were impatient; and the partial acts of severity or injustice which had been recommended by the Arian clergy, were exaggerated by the orthodox writers. The guilt of persecution may be imputed to Euric, king of the Visigoths; who suspended the exercise of ecclesiastical, or, at least, of episcopal, functions; and punished the popular bishops of Aquitain with imprisonment, exile, and confiscation.[1] But the cruel and absurd enterprise of subduing the minds of a whole people, was undertaken by the Vandals alone. Genseric himself (A.D. 429—477), in his early youth, had renounced the orthodox communion; and the apostate could neither grant, nor expect, a sincere forgiveness. He was exasperated to find that the Africans, who had fled before him in the field, still presumed to dispute his will in synods and churches; and his ferocious mind was incapable of fear, or of compassion. His Catholic subjects were oppressed by intolerant laws, and arbitrary punishments. The language of Genseric was furious and formidable; the knowledge of his intentions might justify the most unfavourable interpretation of his actions; and the Arians were reproached with the frequent executions, which stained the palace, and the dominions, of the tyrant. Arms and ambition were, however, the ruling passions of the monarch of the sea. But Hunneric (A.D. 477), his inglorious son, who seemed to inherit only his vices, tormented the Catholics with the same unrelenting fury which had been fatal to his brother, his nephews, and the friends and favourites of his father: and, even to the Arian patriarch, who was inhumanly burnt alive in the midst of Carthage. The religious war was preceded and prepared by an insidious truce; persecution was made the serious and important business of the Vandal court; and the loathsome disease, which hastened the death of Hunneric, revenged the injuries, without contributing to the deliverance, of the church. The throne of Africa was successively filled by the two nephews of Hunneric; by Gundamund (A.D. 484), who reigned about twelve, and by Thrasimund, who governed the nation above twenty-seven years. Their administration was hostile and oppressive to the orthodox party. Gundamund appeared to emulate, or even to surpass, the cruelty of his uncle; and, if at length he relented, if he recalled the bishops, and restored the freedom of Athanasian worship, a premature death intercepted the benefits of his tardy clemency. His brother, Thrasimund (A.D. 496), was the greatest and most accomplished of the Vandal kings, whom he excelled in beauty, prudence, and magnanimity of

[1] Such are the contemporary complaints of Sidonius, bishop of Clermont (l. vii. c. 6. p. 182, &c. edit. Sirmond). Greg. of Tours, who quotes this Epistle (l. ii. c. 25. ii. 174.), extorts an unwarrantable assertion, that of the nine vacancies in Aquitain, some had been produced by episcopal *martyrdoms*.

soul. But this magnanimous character was degraded by his intolerant zeal and deceitful clemency. Instead of threats and tortures, he employed the gentle, but efficacious, powers of seduction. Wealth, dignity, and the royal favour, were the liberal rewards of apostacy, the Catholics, who had violated the laws, might purchase their pardon by the renunciation of their faith; and whenever Thrasimund meditated any rigorous measure, he patiently waited till the indiscretion of his adversaries furnished him with a specious opportunity. Bigotry was his last sentiment in the hour of death: and he exacted from his successor a solemn oath, that he would never tolerate the sectaries of Athanasius. But his successor, Hilderic (A.D. 523), the gentle son of the savage Hunneric, preferred the duties of humanity and justice, to the vain obligation of an impious oath; and his accession was gloriously marked by the restoration of peace and universal freedom. The throne of that virtuous, though feeble monarch, was usurped by his cousin Gelimer (A.D. 530), a zealous Arian: but the Vandal kingdom, before he could enjoy or abuse his power, was subverted by the arms of Belisarius; and the orthodox party retaliated the injuries which they had endured.[1]

The passionate declamations of the Catholics, the sole historians of this persecution, cannot afford any distinct series of causes and events; any impartial view of characters, or counsels; but the most remarkable circumstances, that deserve either credit or notice, may be referred to the following heads: I. In the original law, which is still extant,[2] Hunneric expressly declares, and the declaration appears to be correct, that he had faithfully transcribed the regulations and penalties of the Imperial edicts; against the heretical congregations, the clergy, and the people, who dissented from the established religion. If the rights of conscience had been understood, the Catholics must have condemned their past conduct, or acquiesced in their actual sufferings. But they still persisted to refuse the indulgence which they claimed. While they trembled under the lash of persecution, they praised the *laudable* severity of Hunneric himself, who burnt or banished great numbers of Manichæans;[3] and they rejected, with horror, the ignominious compromise, that the disciples of Arius, and of Athanasius, should enjoy a reciprocal and similar toleration in the territories of the Romans, and in those of the Vandals.[4] II. The practice of a conference, which the Catholics had so frequently used to insult and punish their obstinate antagonists, was retorted against themselves.[5] At the command of Hunneric, four hundred and sixty-

[1] The original monuments of the Vandal persecution are preserved in the five books of the History of Victor Vitensis (de Persecutione Vandalicâ), a bishop who was exiled by Hunneric; in the Life of St. Fulgentius, who was distinguished in the persecution of Thrasimund (in Biblioth. Max. Patrum, ix. p. 4—16.), and in the first book of the Vandalic War by the impartial Procop. (c. 7, 8. p. 196, 197, 198, 199.). Dom Ruinart, the last editor of Victor, has illustrated the whole subject with a copious and learned apparatus of notes and supplement. (Paris, 1694.)

[2] Victor. iv. 2. p. 65. Hunneric refuses the name of Catholics to the *Homoousians*. He describes, as the veri Divinæ Majestatis cultores, his own party, who professed the faith, confirmed by more than 1000 bishops, in the synods of Rimini and Seleucia.

[3] Victor. ii. 1. p. 21, 22. *Laudabilior* . . . videbatur. In the MSS. which omit this word the passage is unintelligible. Ruinart. Not. p. 164.

[4] Victor. ii. 2. p. 22, 23. The clergy of Carthage called these conditions, *periculosæ;* and they seem, indeed, to have been proposed as a snare to entrap the Catholic bishops.

[5] See the narrative of this conference, and the treatment of the bishops, in Victor. ii. 13—18

six orthodox bishops assembled at Carthage; but when they were admitted into the hall of audience, they had the mortification of beholding the Arian Cirila exalted on the patriarchal throne. The disputants were separated, after the mutual and ordinary reproaches of noise and silence, of delay and precipitation, of military force and of popular clamour. One martyr and one confessor were selected among the Catholic bishops; twenty-eight escaped by flight, and eighty-eight by conformity; forty-six were sent into Corsica to cut timber for the royal navy; and three hundred and two were banished to the different parts of Africa, exposed to the insults of their enemies, and carefully deprived of all the temporal and spiritual comforts of life.[1] The hardships of ten years' exile must have reduced their numbers; and if they had complied with the law of Thrasimund, which prohibited any episcopal consecrations, the orthodox church of Africa must have expired with the lives of its actual members. They disobeyed; and their disobedience was punished by a second exile of two hundred and twenty bishops into Sardinia; where they languished fifteen years, till the accession of the gracious Hilderic.[2] The two islands were judiciously chosen by the malice of their Arian tyrants. Seneca, from his own experience, has deplored and exaggerated the miserable state of Corsica,[3] and the plenty of Sardinia was overbalanced by the unwholesome quality of the air.[4] III. The zeal of Genseric, and his successors, for the conversion of the Catholics, must have rendered them still more jealous to guard the purity of the Vandal faith. Before the churches were finally shut, it was a crime to appear in a Barbarian dress; and those who presumed to neglect the royal mandate, were rudely dragged backwards by their long hair.[5] The Palatine officers, who refused to profess the religion of their prince, were ignominiously stripped of their honours and employments; banished to Sardinia and Sicily; or condemned to the servile labours of slaves and peasants in the fields of Utica. In the districts which had been peculiarly allotted to the Vandals, the exercise of the Catholic worship was more strictly prohibited; and severe penalties were denounced against the guilt, both of the missionary and the proselyte. By these arts, the faith of the Barbarians was preserved, and their zeal was inflamed; they discharged, with devout fury, the office of spies, informers, or executioners; and whenever their cavalry took the field, it was

p. 35—42. and the whole fourth book, p. 63—171. The third book, p. 42—62. is entirely filled by their apology or confession of faith.

[1] List of the African bishops, in Victor. p. 117—140. and Ruinart's notes, p. 215—397. The schismatic name of *Donatus* frequently occurs, and they appear to have adopted (like our fanatics of the last age) the pious appellations of *Deodatus*, *Deogratias*, *Quidvultdeus*, *Habetdeum*, &c.

[2] Fulgent. Vit. c. 16—29. Thrasimund affected the praise of moderation and learning; and Fulgentius addressed three books of controversy to the Arian tyrant, whom he styles *piissime Rex*. Biblio. Max. Pat. ix. 41. Only sixty bishops are mentioned as exiles in the Life of Fulgentius; they are increased to one hundred and twenty by Victor Tunnunensis, and Isidore; but the number of two hundred and twenty is specified in the *Historia Miscella*, and a short authentic chronicle of the times. Ruinart, p. 570.

[3] See the base and insipid epigrams of the Stoic, who could not support exile with more fortitude than Ovid. Corsica might not produce corn, wine, or oil; but it could not be destitute of grass, water, and even fire.

[4] Si ob gravitatem cœli interissent, *vile* damnum. Tacit. Annal. ii. 85. In this application, Thrasimund would have adopted the reading of some critics, *utile* damnum.

[5] See these preludes of a *general* persecution, in Victor. ii. 3, 4. 7. and the two edicts of Hunneric, l. ii. p. 35. l. iv. p. 64.

the favourite amusement of the march, to defile the churches, and to insult the clergy of the adverse faction.[1] IV. The citizens who had been educated in the luxury of the Roman province, were delivered, with exquisite cruelty, to the Moors of the desert. A venerable train of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, with a faithful crowd of four thousand and ninety-six persons, whose guilt is not precisely ascertained, were torn from their native homes, by the command of Hunneric. During the night they were confined, like a herd of cattle, amidst their own ordure: during the day they pursued their march over the burning sands; and if they fainted under the heat and fatigue, they were goaded, or dragged along, till they expired in the hands of their tormentors.[2] These unhappy exiles, when they reached the Moorish huts, might excite the compassion of a people, whose native humanity was neither improved by reason, nor corrupted by fanaticism: but if they escaped the dangers, they were condemned to share the distress, of a savage life. V. It is incumbent on the authors of persecution previously to reflect, whether they are determined to support it in the last extreme. They excite the flame which they strive to extinguish; and it soon becomes necessary to chastise the contumacy, as well as the crime of the offender. The fine, which he is unable or unwilling to discharge, exposes his person to the severity of the law; and his contempt of lighter penalties suggests the use and propriety of capital punishment. Through the veil of fiction and declamation, we may clearly perceive, that the Catholics, more especially under the reign of Hunneric, endured the most cruel and ignominious treatment.[3] Respectable citizens, noble matrons, and consecrated virgins, were stripped naked, and raised in the air by pulleys, with a weight suspended at their feet. In this painful attitude their naked bodies were torn with scourges, or burnt in the most tender parts with red-hot plates of iron. The amputation of the ears, the nose, the tongue, and the right-hand, was inflicted by the Arians; and although the precise number cannot be defined, it is evident that many persons, among whom a bishop (*Victor.* ii. 18. p. 41) and a proconsul[4] may be named, were entitled to the crown of martyrdom. The same honour has been ascribed to the memory of count Sebastian, who professed the Nicene creed with unshaken constancy; and Genseric might detest, as an heretic, the brave and ambitious fugitive whom he dreaded as a rival.[5] VI. A new mode of conversion, which might subdue the feeble, and alarm the timorous, was employed by the Arian ministers. They imposed, by fraud or violence, the rites of baptism; and punished the apostacy of the Catholics, if they disclaimed this odious and profane ceremony, which scandalously violated the freedom of the will, and

[1] Procop. de Bell. Vand. l. i. c. 7. p. 197, 198. A Moorish prince endeavoured to propitiate the God of the Christians, by his diligence to eraze the marks of the Vandal sacrilege.

[2] See this story in Victor. ii. 8—12. p. 30—34. Victor describes the distress of these confessors as an eye-witness.

[3] Fifth book of Victor. His passionate complaints are confirmed by the sober testimony of Procopius, and the public declaration of the emperor Justinian. (Cod. l. i. tit. xxvii.)

[4] Victor. v. 4. p. 74, 75. His name was Victorianus, and he was a wealthy citizen of Adrumetum, who enjoyed the confidence of the king; by whose favour he had obtained the office, or at least the title, of proconsul of Africa.

[5] Victor. i. 6. p. 8, 9. After relating the firm resistance and dexterous reply of count Sebastian, he adds, quare alio generis argumento postea bellicosum virum occidit.

the unity of the sacrament.[1] The hostile sects had formerly allowed the validity of each other's baptism; and the innovation, so fiercely maintained by the Vandals, can be imputed only to the example and advice of the Donatists. VII. The Arian clergy surpassed, in religious cruelty, the king and his Vandals; but they were incapable of cultivating the spiritual vineyard, which they were so desirous to possess. A patriarch[2] might seat himself on the throne of Carthage; some bishops, in the principal cities, might usurp the place of their rivals; but the smallness of their numbers, and their ignorance of the Latin language,[3] disqualified the Barbarians for the ecclesiastical ministry of a great church; and the Africans, after the loss of their orthodox pastors, were deprived of the public exercise of Christianity. VIII. The emperors were the natural protectors of the Homoousian doctrine: and the faithful people of Africa, both as Romans and as Catholics, preferred their lawful sovereignty to the usurpation of the Barbarous heretics. During an interval of peace and friendship, Hunneric restored the cathedral of Carthage; at the intercession of Zeno, who reigned in the East, and of Placidia, the daughter and relict of emperors, and the sister of the queen of the Vandals.—*Victor.* ii. 1, 2. p. 22. But this decent regard was of short duration; and the haughty tyrant displayed his contempt for the religion of the Empire, by studiously arranging the bloody images of persecution, in all the principal streets through which the Roman ambassador must pass in his way to the palace.[4] An oath was required from the bishops, who were assembled at Carthage, that they would support the succession of his son Hilderic, and that they would renounce all foreign or *transmarine* correspondence. This engagement, consistent as it should seem with their moral and religious duties, was refused by the more sagacious members[5] of the assembly. Their refusal, faintly coloured by the pretence that it is unlawful for a Christian to swear, must provoke the suspicions of a jealous tyrant.

The Catholics, oppressed by royal and military force, were far superior to their adversaries in numbers and learning. With the same weapons which the Greek[6] and Latin fathers had already provided for the Arian controversy, they repeatedly silenced, or vanquished, the fierce and illiterate successors of Ulphilas. The consciousness of their own superiority might have raised them above the arts, and passions, of religious warfare. Yet instead of assuming such honourable pride,

[1] Victor. v. 12. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. vi. 609.

[2] *Primate* was more properly the title of the bishop of Carthage: but the name of *patriarch* was given by the sects and nations to their principal ecclesiastic. Thomassin, Discip. de l'Eglise i. 155.

[3] The patriarch Cyrila himself publicly declared, that he did not understand Latin (Victor. ii. 18. p. 42.); Nescio Latine; and he might converse with tolerable ease, without being capable of disputing or preaching in that language. His Vandal clergy were still more ignorant; and small confidence could be placed in the Africans, who had conformed.

[4] Victor. v. 7. p. 77. He appeals to the ambassador himself, whose name was Uranius.

[5] *Astutiores*, Victor. iv. 4. p. 70. He plainly intimates that their quotation of the Gospel "Non jurabitis in toto," was only meant to elude the obligation of an inconvenient oath. The forty-six bishops who refused were banished to Corsica: the three hundred and two who swore, were distributed through the provinces of Africa.

[6] Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspæ, in the Byzacene province, was of a senatorial family, and had received a liberal education. He could repeat all Homer and Menander before he was allowed to study Latin, his native tongue (Vit. Fulgent. c. 1.). Many African bishops might understand Greek, and many Greek theologians were translated into Latin

the orthodox theologians were tempted, by the assurance of impunity, to compose fictions, which must be stigmatized with the epithets of fraud and forgery. They ascribed their own polemical works to the most venerable names of Christian antiquity: the characters of Athanasius and Augustin were awkwardly personated by Vigilius and his disciples;[1] and the famous creed, which so clearly expounds the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation, is deduced, with strong probability, from the African school.[2] Even the Scriptures themselves were profaned by their rash and sacrilegious hands. The memorable text, which asserts the unity of the THREE who bear witness in heaven,[3] is condemned by the universal silence of the orthodox fathers, ancient versions, and authentic manuscripts.[4] It was first alleged by the Catholic bishops whom Hunneric summoned to the conference of Carthage.[5] An allegorical interpretation, in the form, perhaps, of a marginal note, invaded the text of the Latin Bibles, which were renewed and corrected in a dark period of ten centuries.[6] After the invention of printing,[7] the editors of the Greek Testament yielded to their own prejudices, or those of the times;[8] and the pious fraud, which was embraced with equal zeal at Rome and at Geneva, has been infinitely multiplied in every country and every language of modern Europe.

The example of fraud must excite suspicion; and the specious miracles by which the African Catholics have defended the truth and

[1] Compare the two prefaces to the Dialogue of Vigilius of Thapsus (p. 118, 119. edit. Chiflet). He might amuse his learned reader with an innocent fiction; but the subject was too grave, and the Africans were too ignorant.

[2] The P. Quesnel started this opinion, which has been favourably received. But the three following truths, however surprising they may seem, are *now* universally acknowledged (Gerard Vossius, vi. p. 516—522. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles. viii. p. 667—671.). 1. St. Athanasius is not the author of the creed which is so frequently read in our churches. 2. It does not appear to have existed, within a century after his death. 3. It was originally composed in the Latin tongue, and, consequently, in the Western provinces. Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople, was so much amazed by this extraordinary composition, that he frankly pronounced it to be the work of a drunken man. Petav. Dog. Theolog. ii. l. vii. c. 8. p. 687.

[3] 1 John v. 7. Simon, Hist. Crit. du Nouv. Testament, part i. c. xviii. 203.; and part ii. c. ix. 99.; and the elaborate Prolegomena and Annotations of Dr. Mill and Wetstein to their editions of the Greek Testament. In 1689, the Papist Simon strove to be free; in 1707, the Protestant Mill wished to be a slave; in 1751, the Arminian Wetstein used the liberty of his times, and of his sect.

[4] Of *all* the MSS. now extant, above fourscore in number, some of which are more than 1200 years old (Wetstein ad loc.). The *orthodox* copies of the Vatican, of the Complutensian editors, of Robert Stephens, are become invisible; and the *two* MSS. of Dublin and Berlin are unworthy to form an exception. Emlyn's Works, ii. p. 227—255. 269—299.; and M. de Missy's four ingenious letters, in viii. and ix. of the Journal Britannique.

[5] Or, more properly, by the *four* bishops who composed and published the profession of faith in the name of their brethren. They style this text, luce clarius (Vict. Vitensis de Persec. Vand. l. iii. c. 11. p. 54.). It is quoted soon afterwards by the African polemics, Vigilius and Fulgentius.

[6] In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the Bibles were corrected by Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, and by Nicholas, cardinal and librarian of the Roman church, secundum orthodoxam fidem (Wetstein, Prolegom. p. 84. 85.). Notwithstanding these corrections, the passage is still wanting in 25 Latin MSS. (Wetstein ad loc.), the oldest and the fairest; two qualities seldom united, except in manuscripts.

[7] The art which the Germans had invented was applied in Italy to the profane writers of Rome and Greece. The original Greek of the New Testament was published about the same time (A.D. 1514. 1516. 1520.) by the industry of Erasmus, and the munificence of Cardinal Ximenes. The Complutensian Polyglot cost the cardinal 50,000 ducats. Mattaire Annal. Typograph. ii. p. 2—8. 125—133.; and Wetstein, Prolegomena, p. 116—127.

[8] The three witnesses have been established in our Greek Testaments by the prudence of Erasmus; the honest bigotry of the Complutensian editors; the typographical fraud, or error, of Robert Stephens in the placing a crotchet; and the deliberate falsehood, or strange misapprehension, of Theodore Beza.

justice of their cause, may be ascribed, with more reason, to their own industry, than to the visible protection of Heaven. Yet the historian, who views this religious conflict with an impartial eye, may condescend to mention *one* preternatural event, which will edify the devout, and surprise the incredulous. Tipasa,[1] a maritime colony of Mauritania, sixteen miles to the east of Cæsarea, had been distinguished, in every age, by the orthodox zeal of its inhabitants. They had braved the fury of the Donatists;[2] they resisted, or eluded, the tyranny of the Arians. The town was deserted on the approach of an heretical bishop: most of the inhabitants who could procure ships passed over to the coast of Spain; and the unhappy remnant, refusing all communion with the usurper, still presumed to hold their pious but illegal assemblies. Their disobedienee exasperated the cruelty of Hunneric. A military count was dispatched from Carthage to Tipasa: he collected the Catholics in the Forum, and, in the presence of the whole province, deprived the guilty of their right-hands and their tongues. But the holy confessors continued to speak without tongues; and this miracle is attested by Victor, an African bishop, who published an history of the persecution within two years after the event.[3] "If any one," says, Victor, "should doubt of the truth, let him repair to Constantinople, "and listen to the clear and perfect language of Restitutus, the sub-"deacon, one of these glorious sufferers, who is now lodged in the "palace of the emperor Zeno, and is respected by the devout empress." At Constantinople we are astonished to find a cool, a learned, an unexceptionable witness, without interest, and without passion. Æneas of Gaza, a Platonic philosopher, has accurately described his own observations on these African sufferers. "I saw them myself: I heard "them speak: I diligently enquired by what means such an articulate "voice could be formed without any organ of speech: I used my eyes "to examine the report of my ears: I opened their mouths, and saw that "the whole tongue had been completely torn away by the roots; an "operation which the physicians generally suppose to be mortal."[4] The testimony of Æneas of Gaza might be confirmed by the superfluous evidence of the emperor Justinian, in a perpetual edict; of count Marcellinus, in his Chronicle of the times; and of Pope Gregory the First, who had resided at Constantinople, as the minister of the Roman pontiff.[5] They all lived within the compass of a century; and they all appealed to their personal knowledge, or the public notoriety, for the truth of a miracle, which was repeated in several instances, displayed on the greatest theatre of the world, and submitted, during

[1] Plin. Hist. Nat. v. 1. Itinerar. Wessel. p. 15. Cellarius, Geog. Antiq. ii. part ii. 127. This Tipasa (which must not be confounded with another in Numidia) was a town of some note, since Vespasian endowed it with the right of Latium.

[2] Optatus Milevitanus de Schism. Donatist. l. ii. p. 38.

[3] Victor. Vitensis, v. 6. p. 76. Ruinart, p. 483—487.

[4] Æneas Gazæus in Theophrasto, in Biblioth. Patrum, tom. viii. p. 664, 665. He was a Christian, and composed this Dialogue (the Theophrastus) on the immortality of the soul, and the resurrection of the body; besides twenty-five Epistles, still extant. Cave (Hist. Litter. p. 297.) and Fabric. (Bibl. Græc. i. 422.).

[5] Justinian. Codex. l. i. tit. xxvii. Marcellin. in Chron. p. 45. in Thesaur. Temporum Scaliger. Procop. de Bell. Vand. l. i. c. 7. p. 196. Gregor. Magnus Dialog. iii. 32. None of these witnesses have specified the number of the confessors, which is fixed at sixty in an old menology (apud Ruinart, p. 486.). Two of them lost their speech by fornication; but the miracle is enhanced by the singular instance of a boy who had *never* spoken before his tongue was cut out.

a series of years, to the calm examination of the senses. This supernatural gift of the African confessors, who spoke without tongues, will command the assent of those, and of those only, who already believe, that their language was pure and orthodox. But the stubborn mind of an infidel is guarded by secret, incurable suspicion; and the Arian, or Socinian, who has seriously rejected the doctrine of the Trinity, will not be shaken by the most plausible evidence of an Athanasian miracle.

The Vandals and the Ostrogoths persevered in the profession of Arianism till the final ruin of the kingdoms which they had founded in Africa and Italy (A.D. 500—700). The Barbarians of Gaul submitted to the orthodox dominion of the Franks; and Spain was restored to the Catholic church by the voluntary conversion of the Visigoths.

This salutary revolution[1] was hastened by the example of a royal martyr, whom our calmer reason may style an ungrateful rebel. Leovigild, the Gothic monarch of Spain, deserved the respect of his enemies, and the love of his subjects: the Catholics enjoyed a free toleration, and his Arian synods attempted, without much success, to reconcile their scruples by abolishing the unpopular rite of a *second* baptism. His eldest son, Hermenegild, who was invested by his father with the royal diadem, and the fair principality of Bœtica (A.D. 577—584), contracted an honourable and orthodox alliance with a Merovingian princess, the daughter of Sigibert, king of Austrasia, and of the famous Brunechild. The beauteous Ingundis, who was no more than thirteen years of age, was received, beloved, and persecuted, in the Arian court of Toledo; and her religious constancy was alternately assaulted with blandishments and violence by Goisvintha, the Gothic queen, who abused the double claim of maternal authority.[2] Incensed by her resistance, Goisvintha seized the Catholic princess by her long hair, inhumanly dashed her against the ground, kicked her till she was covered with blood, and at last gave orders that she should be stripped, and thrown into a bason, or fish-pond.[3] Love and honour might excite Hermenegild to resent this injurious treatment of his bride; and he was gradually persuaded, that Ingundis suffered for the cause of divine truth. Her tender complaints, and the weighty arguments of Leander, archbishop of Seville, accomplished his conversion; and the heir of the Gothic monarchy was initiated in the Nicene faith by the solemn rites of confirmation.[4] The rash youth, inflamed by zeal, and perhaps by ambition, was tempted to violate the duties of a son, and a subject; and the Catholics of Spain, although

[1] See the two general historians of Spain, Mariana (Hist. de Rebus Hispaniæ, i. l. v. c. 12—15. p. 182—194.) and Ferreras (French translation, ii. 206.). Mariana almost forgets that he is a Jesuit, to assume the style and spirit of a Roman classic. Ferreras, an industrious compiler, reviews his facts, and rectifies his chronology.

[2] Goisvintha successively married two kings of the Visigoths: Athanigild, to whom she bore Brunechild, the mother of Ingundis; and Leovigild, whose two sons, Hermenegild and Recared, were the issue of a former marriage.

[3] Iracundiæ furore succensa, adprehensam per comam capitis puellam in terram conlidit, et diu calcibus verberatam, ac sanguine cruentatam, jussit exspoliari, et piscinæ immergi. Greg. Turon. l. v. c. 39. ii. 255. Gregory is one of our best originals for this portion of history.

[4] The Catholics who admitted the baptism of heretics, repeated the rite, or, as it was afterwards styled, the sacrament of confirmation, to which they ascribed many mystic and marvellous prerogatives, both visible and invisible. Chardon Hist. des Sacramens, i. 405—552.

they could not complain of persecution, applauded his pious rebellion against an heretical father. The civil war was protracted by the long and obstinate sieges of Merida, Cordova, and Seville, which had strenuously espoused the party of Hermenegild. He invited the orthodox Barbarians, the Suevi, and the Franks, to the destruction of his native land: he solicited the dangerous aid of the Romans, who possessed Africa, and a part of the Spanish coast; and his holy ambassador, the archbishop Leander, effectually negociated in person with the Byzantine court. But the hopes of the Catholics were crushed by the active diligence of a monarch who commanded the troops and treasures of Spain; and the guilty Hermenegild, after his vain attempts to resist or to escape, was compelled to surrender himself into the hands of an incensed father. Leovigild was still mindful of that sacred character; and the rebel, despoiled of the legal ornaments, was still permitted, in a decent exile, to profess the Catholic religion. His repeated and unsuccessful treasons at length provoked the indignation of the Gothic king; and the sentence of death, which he pronounced with apparent reluctance, was privately executed in the tower of Seville. The inflexible constancy with which he refused to accept the Arian communion, as the price of his safety, may excuse the honours that have been paid to the memory of St. Hermenegild. His wife and infant son were detained by the Romans in ignominious captivity: and this domestic misfortune tarnished the glories of Leovigild, and embittered the last moments of his life.

His son and successor, Recared (A.D. 586—589), the first Catholic king of Spain, had imbibed the faith of his unfortunate brother, which he supported with more prudence and success. Instead of revolting against his father, Recared patiently expected the hour of his death. Instead of condemning his memory, he piously supposed, that the dying monarch had abjured the errors of Arianism, and recommended to his son the conversion of the Gothic nation. To accomplish that salutary end, Recared convened an assembly of the Arian clergy and nobles, declared himself a Catholic, and exhorted them to imitate the example of their prince. The laborious interpretation of doubtful texts, or the curious pursuit of metaphysical arguments, would have excited an endless controversy; and the monarch discreetly proposed to his illiterate audience, two substantial and visible arguments, the testimony of Earth and of Heaven. The *Earth* had submitted to the Nicene synod: the Romans, the Barbarians, and the inhabitants of Spain, unanimously professed the same orthodox creed; and the Visigoths resisted, almost alone, the consent of the Christian world. A superstitious age was prepared to reverence, as the testimony of *Heaven*, the preternatural cures, which were performed by the skill or virtue of the Catholic clergy; the baptismal fonts of Osset in Bœtica,[1] which were spontaneously replenished each year, on the vigil of Easter;[2] and the miraculous shrine of St. Martin of Tours, which had

[1] Osset, or Julia Constantia, was opposite to Seville, on the northern side of the Bœtis (Plin. Hist. Natur. iii. 3.); and the authentic reference of Greg. of Tours (Hist. Francor. l. vi. c. 43. p. 288.) deserves more credit than the name of Lusitania (de Gloria Martyr. c. 24.), which has been eagerly embraced by the vain and superstitious Portuguese (Ferreras, Hist. d'Espagne, ii. 166.).

[2] This miracle was skilfully performed. An Arian king sealed the doors, and dug a deep

already converted the Suevic prince and people of Gallicia.[1] The Catholic king encountered some difficulties on this important change of the national religion. A conspiracy, secretly fomented by the queen-dowager, was formed against his life; and two counts excited a dangerous revolt in the Narbonnese Gaul. But Recared disarmed the conspirators, defeated the rebels, and executed severe justice; which the Arians, in their turn, might brand with the reproach of persecution. Eight bishops, whose names betray their Barbaric origin, abjured their errors; and all the books of Arian theology were reduced to ashes, with the house in which they had been purposely collected. The whole body of the Visigoths and Suevi were allured or driven into the pale of the Catholic communion; the faith, at least of the rising generation, was fervent and sincere; and the devout liberality of the Barbarians enriched the churches and monasteries of Spain. Seventy bishops, assembled in the council of Toledo, received the submission of their conquerors; and the zeal of the Spaniards improved the Nicene creed, by declaring the procession of the Holy Ghost, from the Son, as well as from the Father; a weighty point of doctrine, which produced, long afterwards, the schism of the Greek and Latin churches.[2] The royal proselyte immediately saluted and consulted pope Gregory, surnamed the Great, a learned and holy prelate, whose reign was distinguished by the conversion of heretics and infidels. The ambassadors of Recared respectfully offered on the threshold of the Vatican his rich presents of gold and gems: they accepted, as a lucrative exchange, the hairs of St. John the Baptist; a cross, which inclosed a small piece of the true wood; and a key, that contained some particles of iron which had been scraped from the chains of St. Peter.[3]

The same Gregory, the spiritual conqueror of Britain, encouraged the pious Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards (A.D. 600, &c.), to propagate the Nicene faith among the victorious savages, whose recent Christianity was polluted by the Arian heresy. Her devout labours still left room for the industry and success of future missionaries; and many cities of Italy were still disputed by hostile bishops. But the cause of Arianism was gradually suppressed by the weight of truth, of interest, and of example; and the controversy, which Egypt had derived from the Platonic school, was terminated, after a war of three hundred years by the final conversion of the Lombards of Italy.[4]

The first missionaries who preached the gospel to the Barbarians, appealed to the evidence of reason, and claimed the benefit of tolera-

trench round the church, without being able to intercept the Easter supply of baptismal water.

[1] Ferreras (ii. 168. A.D. 550.) has illustrated the difficulties which regard the time and circumstances of the conversion of the Suevi. They had been recently united by Leovigild to the Gothic monarchy of Spain.

[2] This addition to the Nicene, or rather the Constantinopolitan creed, was first made in the eighth council of Toledo, A.D. 653; but it was expressive of the popular doctrine (Gerard Vossius, vi. p. 527. de tribus Symbolis).

[3] Gregor. Magn. l. vii. epist. 126. apud Baron. Annal. Eccles. A.D. 599. No. 25, 26.

[4] Paul Warnefrid (de Gestis, Langobard. l. iv. c. 44. p. 853. edit. Grot.) allows that Arianism still prevailed under the reign of Rotharis (A.D. 636—652.). The pious *Deacon* does not attempt to mark the precise æra of the national conversion, which was accomplished, however, before the end of the seventh century.

tion.[1] But no sooner had they established their spiritual dominion, than they exhorted the Christian kings to extirpate, without mercy, the remains of Roman or Barbaric superstition. The successors of Clovis inflicted one hundred lashes on the peasants who refused to destroy their idols; the crime of sacrificing to the dæmons was punished by the Anglo-Saxon laws with the heavier penalties of imprisonment and confiscation; and even the wise Alfred adopted, as an indispensable duty, the extreme rigour of the Mosaic institutions.[2] But the punishment, and the crime, were gradually abolished among a Christian people: the theological disputes of the schools were suspended by propitious ignorance; and the intolerant spirit, which could find neither idolaters nor heretics, was reduced to the persecution of the Jews (A.D. 612—712). That exiled nation had founded some synagogues in the cities of Gaul; but Spain, since the time of Hadrian, was filled with their numerous colonies.[3] The wealth which they accumulated by trade, and the management of the finances, invited the pious avarice of their masters; and they might be oppressed without danger, as they had lost the use, and even the remembrance, of arms. Sisebut, a Gothic king, who reigned in the beginning of the seventh century, proceeded at once to the last extremes of persecution.[4] Ninety thousand Jews were compelled to receive the sacrament of baptism; the fortunes of the obstinate infidels were confiscated, their bodies were tortured; and it seems doubtful whether they were permitted to abandon their native country. The excessive zeal of the Catholic king was moderated, even by the clergy of Spain, who solemnly pronounced an inconsistent sentence: *that* the sacraments should not be forcibly imposed; but *that* the Jews who had been baptized should be constrained, for the honour of the church, to persevere in the external practice of a religion which they disbelieved and detested. Their frequent relapses provoked one of the successors of Sisebut to banish the whole nation from his dominions; and a council of Toledo published a decree, that every Gothic king should swear to maintain this salutary edict. But the tyrants were unwilling to dismiss the victims, whom they delighted to torture, or to deprive themselves of the industrious slaves, over whom they might exercise a lucrative oppression. The Jews still continued in Spain, under the weight of the civil and ecclesiastical laws, which in the same country have been faithfully transcribed in the Code of the Inquisition. The Gothic kings and bishops at length discovered, that injuries will produce hatred, and that hatred will find the opportunity of revenge. A nation, the secret or professed enemies of Christianity,

[1] Quorum fidei et conversioni ita congratulatus esse rex perhibetur, ut nullum tamen cogeret ad Christianismum . . . . Didicerat enim a doctoribus auctoribusquæ suæ salutis, servitium Christi voluntarium non coactitium esse debere. Bedæ Hist. Ecclesiastic. l. i. c. 26. p. 62, edit. Smith.

[2] Historians of France, iv. p. 114.; and Wilkins, Leges Anglo-Saxonicæ, p. 11. 31. Siquis sacrificium immolaverit præter Deo soli morte moriatur.

[3] The Jews pretend that they were introduced into Spain by the fleets of Solomon, and the arms of Nebuchadnezzar; that Hadrian transported forty thousand families of the tribe of Judah, and ten thousand of the tribe of Benjamin, &c. Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, vii. c. 9. p. 240—256.

[4] Isidore, at that time archbishop of Seville, mentions, disapproves, and congratulates, the zeal of Sisebut (Chron. Goth. p. 728.). Baron. (A.D. 614, No. 41.) assigns the number on the evidence of Aimoin (l. iv. c. 22.): but the evidence is weak, and I have not been able to verify the quotation (Historians of France, iii. p. 127.).

still multiplied in servitude and distress; and the intrigues of the Jews promoted the rapid success of the Arabian conquerors.[1]

As soon as the Barbarians withdrew their powerful support, the unpopular heresy of Arius sunk into contempt and oblivion. But the Greeks still retained their subtle and loquacious disposition: the establishment of an obscure doctrine suggested new questions, and new disputes; and it was always in the power of an ambitious prelate, or a fanatic monk, to violate the peace of the church, and, perhaps, of the empire. The historian of the empire may overlook those disputes which were confined to the obscurity of schools and synods. The Manichæans, who laboured to reconcile the religions of Christ and of Zoroaster, had secretly introduced themselves into the provinces: but these foreign sectaries were involved in the common disgrace of the Gnostics, and the Imperial laws were executed by the public hatred. The rational opinions of the Pelagians were propagated from Britain to Rome, Africa, and Palestine, and silently expired in a superstitious age. But the East was distracted by the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies; which attempted to explain the mystery of the incarnation, and hastened the ruin of Christianity in her native land. These controversies were first agitated under the reign of the younger Theodosius: but their important consequences extend far beyond the limits of the present volume. The metaphysical chain of argument, the contests of ecclesiastical ambition, and their political influence on the decline of the Byzantine empire, may afford an interesting and instructive series of history, from the general councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, to the conquest of the East by the successors of Mahomet.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Reign and Conversion of Clovis.—His Victories over the Alemanni, Burgundians, and Visigoths.—Establishment of the French Monarchy in Gaul.—Laws of the Barbarians.—State of the Romans.—The Visigoths of Spain.—Conquest of Britain by the Saxons.

THE Gauls,[2] who impatiently supported the Roman yoke, received a memorable lesson from one of the lieutenants of Vespasian, whose weighty sense has been refined and expressed by the genius of Tacitus.[3] "The protection of the republic has delivered Gaul from internal dis-

[1] Basnage (viii. c. 13. p. 338—400.) faithfully represents the state of the Jews: but he might have added from the canons of the Spanish councils, and the laws of the Visigoths, many curious circumstances, essential to his subject, though they are foreign to mine.

[2] In this chapter I shall draw my quotations from the Recueil des Hist. des Gaul. et de la France, Paris, 1738—1767, 11 vols. fol. By the labour of Dom. Boquet, and the other Benedictines, all the original testimonies, as far as A.D. 1060, are disposed in chronological order, and illustrated with learned notes. Such a national work, which will be continued to the year 1500, might provoke our emulation.

[3] Tacit. Hist. iv. 73. i. p. 445. To abridge Tacitus, would indeed be presumptuous; but I may select the general ideas which he applies to the present state and future revolutions of Gaul.

"cord, and foreign invasions. By the loss of national independence, "you have acquired the name and privileges of Roman citizens. You "enjoy, in common with ourselves, the permanent benefits of civil "government; and your remote situation is less exposed to the accidental mischiefs of tyranny. Instead of exercising the rights of con- "quest, we have been contented to impose such tributes as are requisite "for your own preservation. Peace cannot be secured without armies; "and armies must be supported at the expence of the people. It is "for your sake, not for our own, that we guard the barrier of the Rhine "against the ferocious Germans, who have so often attempted, and who "will always desire, to exchange the solitude of their woods and "morasses for the wealth and fertility of Gaul. The fall of Rome "would be fatal to the provinces; and you would be buried in the "ruins of that mighty fabric, which has been raised by the valour and "wisdom of eight hundred years. Your imaginary freedom would be "insulted and oppressed by a savage master; and the expulsion of the "Romans would be succeeded by the eternal hostilities of the Bar- "barian conquerors."[1] This salutary advice was accepted, and this strange prediction was accomplished. In the space of 400 years, the hardy Gauls, who had encountered the arms of Cæsar, were imperceptibly melted into the general mass of citizens and subjects: the Western empire was dissolved; and the Germans, who had passed the Rhine, fiercely contended for the possession of Gaul, and excited the contempt, or abhorrence, of its peaceful and polished inhabitants. With that conscious pride which the pre-eminence of knowledge and luxury seldom fails to inspire, they derided the hairy and gigantic savages of the North; their rustic manners, dissonant joy, voracious appetite, and their horrid appearance, equally disgusting to the sight and to the smell. The liberal studies were still cultivated in the schools of Autun and Bordeaux; and the language of Cicero and Virgil was familiar to the Gallic youth. Their ears were astonished by the harsh and unknown sounds of the Germanic dialect, and they ingeniously lamented that the trembling muses fled from the harmony of a Burgundian lyre. The Gauls were endowed with all the advantages of art and nature; but as they wanted courage to defend them, they were justly condemned to obey, and even to flatter, the victorious Barbarians, by whose clemency they held their precarious fortunes and their lives.[2]

As soon as Odoacer had extinguished the Western empire, he sought the friendship of the most powerful of the Barbarians. The new sovereign of Italy resigned (A.D. 476—485) to Euric, king of the Visigoths, all the Roman conquests beyond the Alps, as far as the Rhine and the Ocean:[3] and the senate might confirm this liberal gift with some ostentation of power, and without any real loss of revenue or

[1] Eadem semper causa Germanis transcendendi in Gallias libido atque avaritiæ et mutandæ sedis amor; ut relictis paludibus et solitudinibus fuis, fecundissimum hoc solum vosque ipsos possiderent. . . . Nam pulsis Romanis quid aliud quam bella omnium inter se gentium exsistent?

[2] Sidon. Apollin. ridicules, with affected wit and pleasantry, the hardships of his situation (Carm. xii. i. 811.).

[3] Procop. de Bell. Goth. l. i. c. 12. ii. 31. The character of Grotius inclines me to believe, that he has not substituted the *Rhine* for the *Rhône* (Hist. Goth. p. 175.) without the authority of some MS.

dominion. The lawful pretensions of Euric were justified by ambition and success; and the Gothic nation might aspire, under his command, to the monarchy of Spain and Gaul. Arles and Marseilles surrendered to his arms: he oppressed the freedom of Auvergne; and the bishop condescended to purchase his recall from exile by a tribute of just, but reluctant, praise. Sidonius waited before the gates of the palace among a crowd of ambassadors and suppliants; and their various business at the court of Bordeaux attested the power, and the renown, of the king of the Visigoths. The Heruli of the distant ocean, who painted their naked bodies with its cærulean colour, implored his protection; and the Saxons respected the maritime provinces of a prince, who was destitute of any naval force. The tall Burgundians submitted to his authority; nor did he restore the captive Franks, till he had imposed on that fierce nation the terms of an unequal peace. The Vandals of Africa cultivated his useful friendship; and the Ostrogoths of Pannonia were supported by his powerful aid against the oppression of the neighbouring Huns. The North (such are the lofty strains of the poet) was agitated, or appeased, by the nod of Euric; the great king of Persia consulted the oracle of the West; and the aged god of the Tyber was protected by the swelling genius of the Garonne.[1] The fortune of nations has often depended on accidents; and France may ascribe her greatness to the premature death of the Gothic king, at a time when his son Alaric was an helpless infant, and his adversary Clovis[2] an ambitious and valiant youth.

While Childeric, the father of Clovis, lived an exile in Germany, he was hospitably entertained by the queen, as well as by the king, of the Thuringians. After his restoration, Basina escaped from her husband's bed to the arms of her lover; freely declaring, that if she had known a man wiser, stronger, or more beautiful, than Childeric, that man should have been the object of her preference.[3] Clovis (A.D. 481–511) was the offspring of this voluntary union; and, when he was no more than fifteen years of age, he succeeded, by his father's death, to the command of the Salian tribe. The narrow limits of his kingdom[4] were confined to the island of the Batavians, with the ancient dioceses of Tournay and Arras;[5] and at the baptism of Clovis, the number of his warriors could not exceed five thousand. The kindred tribes of the Franks, who had seated themselves along the Belgic rivers, the Scheld, the Meuse, the Moselle, and the Rhine, were governed by their independent kings, of the Merovingian race; the equals, the allies, and sometimes the enemies, of the Salic prince. But the Germans, who

[1] Sidon. l. viii. epist. 3. 9. i. 800. Jornan. (de Reb. Get. c. 47. p. 680.) justifies, in some measure, this portrait of the Gothic hero.

[2] I use the familiar appellation of *Clovis*, from the Latin *Chlodovechus*, or *Chlodovæus*. But the *Ch* expresses only the German aspiration; and the true name is not different from *Luduin*, or *Lewis* (Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. xx. 68.).

[3] Greg. Turon. l. ii. c. 12. i. 168. The Franks, who had seen her in their youth, might converse with Gregory in their old age; and the bishop of Tours could not wish to defame the mother of the first Christian king.

[4] Dubos (Hist. Crit. de l'Etabliss. de la Monarch. Franc. dans les Gaul. i. 630.) has the merit of defining the primitive kingdom of Clovis, and of ascertaining the genuine number of his subjects.

[5] Ecclesiam incultam ac negligentiâ civium Paganorum prætermissam, veprium desitato oppletam, &c. Vit. St. Vedasti, iii. 372. This description supposes that Arras was possessed by the Pagans, many years before the baptism of Clovis.

obeyed, in peace, the hereditary jurisdiction of their chiefs, were free to follow the standard of a popular and victorious general; and the superior merit of Clovis attracted the respect and allegiance of the national confederacy. When he first took the field, he had neither gold and silver in his coffers, nor wine and corn in his magazines:[1] but he imitated the example of Cæsar, who, in the same country, had acquired wealth by the sword, and purchased soldiers with the fruits of conquest. After each successful battle or expedition, the spoils were accumulated in one common mass; every warrior received his proportionable share, and the royal prerogative submitted to the equal regulations of military law. The untamed spirit of the Barbarians was taught to acknowledge the advantages of regular discipline.[2] At the annual review of the month of March, their arms were diligently inspected; and when they traversed a peaceful territory, they were prohibited from touching a blade of grass. The justice of Clovis was inexorable; and his careless or disobedient soldiers were punished with instant death. It would be superfluous to praise the valour of a Frank; but the valour of Clovis was directed by cool and consummate prudence.[3] In all his transactions with mankind, he calculated the weight of interest, of passion, and of opinion; and his measures were sometimes adapted to the sanguinary manners of the Germans, and sometimes moderated by the milder genius of Rome, and Christianity. He was intercepted in the career of victory, since he died in the forty-fifth year of his age: but he had already accomplished, in a reign of thirty years, the establishment of the French monarchy in Gaul.

The first exploit of Clovis was (A.D. 486) the defeat of Syagrius, the son of Ægidius; and the public quarrel might, on this occasion, be inflamed by private resentment. The glory of the father still insulted the Merovingian race; the power of the son might excite the jealous ambition of the king of the Franks. Syagrius inherited, as a patrimonial estate, the city and diocese of Soissons: the desolate remnant of the second Belgic, Rheims and Troyes, Beauvais and Amiens, would naturally submit to the count or patrician;[4] and after the dissolution of the Western empire, he might reign with the title, or at least with the authority, of king of the Romans.[5] As a Roman, he had been educated in the liberal studies of rhetoric and jurisprudence; but he was engaged by accident and policy in the familiar use of the Germanic idiom. The independent Barbarians resorted to the tribunal of a stranger who possessed the singular talent of explaining, in

[1] Greg. of Tours (l. v. c. 1. ii. 232.) contrasts the poverty of Clovis with the wealth of his grandsons. Yet Remigius (iv. 52.) mentions his *paternas opes*, as sufficient for the redemption of captives.

[2] Greg. (l. ii. c. 27. 37. ii. 175.). The famous story of the vase of Soissons explains both the power and the character of Clovis. As a point of controversy, it has been strangely tortured by Boulainvilliers, Dubos, and the other political antiquarians.

[3] The duke of Nivernois, a noble statesman, who has managed weighty and delicate negociations, ingeniously illustrates (Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. xx. 147.) the political system of Clovis.

[4] M. Biet (in a Dissertation which deserved the prize of the Academy of Soissons, p. 178—226.) has accurately defined the nature and extent of the kingdom of Syagrius, and his father; but he too readily allows the slight evidence of Dubos (ii. 54.) to deprive him of Beauvais and Amiens.

[5] Fredegarius, in his Epitome of Greg. of Tours (ii. 398.), has prudently substituted the name of *Patricius* for the incredible title of *Rex Romanorum*

their native tongue, the dictates of reason and equity. The diligence and affability of their judge rendered him popular, the impartial wisdom of his decrees obtained their voluntary obedience, and the reign of Syagrius over the Franks and Burgundians, seemed to revive the original institution of civil society.[1] In the midst of these peaceful occupations, Syagrius received, and boldly accepted, the hostile defiance of Clovis; who challenged his rival, in the spirit, and almost in the language, of chivalry, to appoint the day, and the field,[2] of battle. In the time of Cæsar, Soissons would have poured forth a body of 50,000 horse; and such an army might have been plentifully supplied with shields, cuirasses, and military engines, from the three arsenals, or manufactures, of the city.[3] But the courage and numbers of the Gallic youth were long since exhausted; and the loose bands of volunteers, or mercenaries, who marched under the standard of Syagrius, were incapable of contending with the national valour of the Franks. It would be ungenerous, without some more accurate knowledge of his strength and resources, to condemn the rapid flight of Syagrius, who escaped, after the loss of a battle, to the distant court of Thoulouse. The feeble minority of Alaric could not assist, or protect, an unfortunate fugitive; the pusillanimous[4] Goths were intimidated by the menaces of Clovis; and the Roman *king*, after a short confinement, was delivered into the hands of the executioner. The Belgic cities surrendered to the king of the Franks; and his dominions were enlarged towards the East by the ample diocese of Tongres,[5] which Clovis subdued in the tenth year of his reign.

The name of the Alemanni has been absurdly derived from their imaginary settlement on the banks of the *Leman* lake.[6] That fortunate district, from the lake to Avenche, and Mount Jura, was occupied by the Burgundians.[7] The northern parts of Helvetia had indeed been subdued by the ferocious Alemanni, who (A.D. 496) destroyed with their own hands the fruits of their conquest. A province, improved and adorned by the arts of Rome, was again reduced to a

[1] Sidon. (l. v. epist. 5. i. 794.), who styles him the Solon, the Amphion of the Barbarians, addresses this imaginary king in the tone of friendship and equality. From such offices of arbitration, the crafty Dejoces had raised himself to the throne of the Medes (Herodotus l. i. c. 96—100.).

[2] Campum sibi præparari jussit. M. Biet (p. 226.) has diligently ascertained this field of battle at Nogent, a Benedictine abbey, about 10 miles to the north of Soissons. The ground was marked by a circle of Pagan sepulchres; and Clovis bestowed the adjacent lands of Leuilly and Coucy on the church of Rheims.

[3] Cæsar. Com. de Bell. Gall. ii. 4. i. 220. and the Notitiæ, i. 126. The three *Fabricæ* of Soissons were *Scutaria, Balistaria,* and *Clinabaria.* The last supplied the complete armour of the heavy cuirassiers.

[4] The epithet must be confined to the circumstances; and history cannot justify the French prejudices of Gregory (l. ii. c. 27. ii. 175.), ut Gothorum pavere *mos* est.

[5] Dubos has satisfied me (i. 277.) that Gregory of Tours, his transcribers or his readers, have repeatedly confounded the German kingdom of *Thuringia*, beyond the Rhine, and the Gallic *city* of *Tongria*, on the Meuse, which was more anciently the country of the Eburones, and more recently the diocese of Liege.

[6] Populi habitantes juxta *Lemannum* lacum, *Alemanni* dicuntur. Servius, ad Virgil. Georgic. iv. 278. Bouquet (i. 817.) has only alleged the more recent and corrupt text of Isidore of Seville.

[7] Gregory of Tours sends St. Lupicinus inter illa Jurensis deserti secreta, quæ, inter Burgundiam Alemanniamque sita, Aventicæ adjacent civitati, i. 648. Watteville (Hist. de la Confed. Helvet. i. 9.) has accurately defined the Helvetian limits of the duchy of Alemannia, and the Tranjurane Burgundy. They were commensurate with the dioceses of Constance and Avenche, or Lausanne, and are still discriminated, in modern Switzerland, by the use of the German, or French, language.

savage wilderness; and some vestige of the stately Vindonissa may still be discovered in the fertile and populous valley of the Aar.[1] From the source of the Rhine, to its conflux with the Mein and the Moselle, the formidable swarms of the Alemanni commanded either side of the river, by the right of ancient possession, or recent victory. They had spread themselves into Gaul, over the modern provinces of Alsace and Lorraine; and their bold invasion of the kingdom of Cologne summoned the Salic prince to the defence of his Ripuarian allies. Clovis encountered the invaders of Gaul in the plain of Tolbiac, about 24 miles from Cologne; and the two fiercest nations of Germany were mutually animated by the memory of past exploits, and the prospect of future greatness. The Franks, after an obstinate struggle, gave way; and the Alemanni, raising a shout of victory, impetuously pressed their retreat. But the battle was restored by the valour, the conduct, and perhaps by the piety, of Clovis; and the event of the bloody day decided for ever the alternative of empire or servitude. The last king of the Alemanni was slain in the field, and his people was slaughtered and pursued, till they threw down their arms, and yielded to the mercy of the conqueror. Without discipline it was impossible for them to rally; they had contemptuously demolished the walls and fortifications which might have protected their distress; and they were followed into the heart of their forests, by an enemy, not less active, or intrepid, than themselves. The great Theodoric congratulated the victory of Clovis, whose sister Albofleda the king of Italy had lately married; but he mildly interceded with his brother in favour of the suppliants and fugitives, who had implored his protection. The Gallic territories, which were possessed by the Alemanni, became the prize of their conqueror; and the haughty nation, invincible, or rebellious, to the arms of Rome, acknowledged the sovereignty of the Merovingian kings, who graciously permitted them to enjoy their peculiar manners and institutions, under the government of official, and, at length, of hereditary, dukes. After the conquest of the Western provinces, the Franks alone maintained their ancient habitations beyond the Rhine. They gradually subdued, and civilized, the exhausted countries, as far as the Elbe, and the mountains of Bohemia; and the peace of Europe was secured by the obedience of Germany.[2]

Till (A.D. 496) the thirtieth year of his age, Clovis continued to worship the gods of his ancestors.[3] His disbelief, or rather disregard, of Christianity, might encourage him to pillage with less remorse the

[1] Guilliman. de Reb. Helvet. l. i. c. 3. p. 11. Within the ancient walls of Vindonissa, the castle of Hapsburgh, the abbey of Konigsfield, and the town of Bruck, have successively arisen. The philosophic traveller may compare the monuments of Roman conquest, of feudal or Austrian tyranny, of monkish superstition, and of industrious freedom. If he be truly a philosopher, he will applaud the merit and happiness of his own times.

[2] Greg. of Tours (l. ii. 30. ii. 176.), the Gesta Francorum (ii. 551.), and the epistle of Theodoric (Cassiodor. Variar. l. ii. c. 41. iv. 4.), represent the defeat of the Alemanni. Some of their tribes settled in Rhætia, under the protection of Theodoric; whose successors ceded the colony and their country to the grandson of Clovis. The state of the Alemanni under the Merovingian kings, may be seen in Mascou (Hist. of the Anc. Germans, xi. 8. Annot. xxxvi.) and Guilliman (de Reb. Helvet. l. ii. c. 10—12. p. 72.).

[3] Clotilda, or rather Gregory, supposes that Clovis worshipped the gods of Greece and Rome. The fact is incredible, and the mistake only shows how completely, in less than a century, the national religion of the Franks had been abolished, and even forgotten.

churches of an hostile territory: but his subjects of Gaul enjoyed the free exercise of religious worship; and the bishops entertained a more favourable hope of the idolater, than of the heretics. The Merovingian prince had contracted a fortunate alliance with the fair Clotilda, the niece of the king of Burgundy, who, in the midst of an Arian court, was educated in the profession of the Catholic faith. It was her interest, as well as her duty, to achieve the conversion[1] of a Pagan husband; and Clovis insensibly listened to the voice of love and religion. He consented (perhaps such terms had been previously stipulated) to the baptism of his eldest son; and though the sudden death of the infant excited some superstitious fears, he was persuaded, a second time, to repeat the dangerous experiment. In the distress of the battle of Tolbiac, Clovis loudly invoked the God of Clotilda and the Christians; and victory disposed him to hear, with respectful gratitude, the eloquent[2] Remigius,[3] bishop of Rheims, who forcibly displayed the temporal and spiritual advantages of his conversion. The king declared himself satisfied of the truth of the Catholic faith; and the political reasons which might have suspended his public profession, were removed by the devout or loyal acclamations of the Franks, who showed themselves alike prepared to follow their heroic leader, to the field of battle, or to the baptismal font. The important ceremony was performed in the cathedral of Rheims, with every circumstance of magnificence and solemnity, that could impress an awful sense of religion on the minds of its rude proselytes.[4] The new Constantine was immediately baptized, with 3000 of his warlike subjects; and their example was imitated by the remainder of the *gentle Barbarians*, who, in obedience to the victorious prelate, adored the cross which they had burnt, and burnt the idols which they had formerly adored.[5] The mind of Clovis was susceptible of transient fervour: he was exasperated by the pathetic tale of the passion and death of Christ; and, instead of weighing the salutary consequences of that mysterious sacrifice, he exclaimed with indiscreet fury, "Had I "been present at the head of my valiant Franks, I would have re-"venged his injuries."[6] But the savage conqueror of Gaul was inca-

[1] Greg. of Tours relates the marriage and conversion of Clovis (l. ii. c. 28—31. ii. 175.). Even Fredegarius, or the nameless Epitomizer (ii. 398.), the author of the Gesta Francorum (ii. 548.), and Aimoin himself (l. i. c. 13. iii. 37.), may be heard without disdain. Tradition might long preserve some curious circumstances of these important transactions.

[2] A traveller, who returned from Rheims to Auvergne, had stolen a copy of his Declamations from the secretary or bookseller of the modest archbishop (Sidon. Apollin. l. ix. epist. 7.). Four epistles of Remigius, which are still extant (iv. 51.), do not correspond with the splendid praise of Sidonius.

[3] Hincmar, one of the successors of Remigius (A.D. 845.), has composed his Life (iii. 373.). The authority of ancient MSS. of the church of Rheims might inspire some confidence, which is destroyed, however, by the selfish and audacious fictions of Hincmar. It is remarkable enough, that Remigius, who was consecrated at the age of twenty-two (A.D. 457.) filled the episcopal chair seventy-four years. Pagi Critica, in Baron. ii. 384.

[4] A vial (the *Sainte Ampoulle*) of holy, or rather celestial, oil, was brought down by a white dove, for the baptism of Clovis, and it is still used, and renewed, in the coronation of the kings of France. Hincmar (he aspired to the primacy of Gaul) is the first author of this fable (iii. 377.) whose slight foundations the Abbé de Vertot, (Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. ii. 619.) has undermined, with profound respect, and consummate dexterity.

[5] Mitis depone colla, Sicamber: adora quod incendisti, incende quod adorasti. Greg. Turon. l. ii. c. 31. ii. 177.

[6] Si ego ibidem cum Francis meis fuissem, injurias ejus vindicassem. This rash expression, which Gregory has prudently concealed, is celebrated by Fredegarius (Epitom. c. 21. ii.

pable of examining the proofs of a religion which depends on the laborious investigation of historic evidence, and speculative theology. He was still more incapable of feeling the mild influence of the gospel, which persuades and purifies the heart of a genuine convert. His ambitious reign was a perpetual violation of moral and Christian duties; his hands were stained with blood, in peace as well as in war; and, as soon as Clovis had dismissed a synod of the Gallican church, he calmly assassinated *all* the princes of the Merovingian race.[1] Yet the king of the Franks might sincerely worship the Christian God, as a Being more excellent and powerful than his national deities; and the signal deliverance and victory of Tolbiac encouraged Clovis to confide in the future protection of the Lord of Hosts. Martin, the most popular of the saints, had filled the Western world with the fame of those miracles, which were incessantly performed at his holy sepulchre of Tours. His visible or invisible aid promoted the cause of a liberal and orthodox prince; and the profane remark of Clovis himself, that St. Martin was an expensive friend,[2] need not be interpreted as the symptom of any permanent, or rational, scepticism. But earth, as well as heaven, rejoiced in the conversion of the Franks. On the memorable day, when Clovis ascended from the baptismal font, he alone, in the Christian world, deserved the name and prerogatives of a Catholic king. The emperor Anastasius entertained some dangerous errors concerning the nature of the divine incarnation; and the Barbarians of Italy, Africa, Spain, and Gaul were involved in the Arian heresy. The eldest, or rather the only, son of the church, was acknowledged by the clergy as their lawful sovereign, or glorious deliverer; and the arms of Clovis were strenuously supported by the zeal and favour of the Catholic faction.[3]

Under the Roman empire, the wealth and jurisdiction of the bishops, their sacred character, and perpetual office, their numerous dependents, popular eloquence, and provincial assemblies, had rendered them always respectable, and sometimes dangerous. Their influence was augmented with the progress of superstition, and the establishment of the French monarchy may, in some degree, be ascribed to the firm alliance of an hundred prelates, who reigned in the discontented, or independent, cities of Gaul. The slight foundations of the *Armorican* republic had been repeatedly shaken, or overthrown; but the same people still guarded their domestic freedom; asserted the dignity of the Roman name; and bravely resisted the predatory inroads, and regular attacks, of Clovis, who laboured to extend his conquests from the Seine to the Loire. Their successful opposition (A.D. 497, &c.) in-

400.), Aimoin (l. i. c. 16. iii. 40.), and the Chroniques de St. Denys (l. i. c. 20. iii. 171.), as an admirable effusion of Christian zeal.

[1] Greg. (l. ii. c. 40—43. ii. 183.), after coolly relating the repeated crimes, and affected remorse, of Clovis, concludes, perhaps undesignedly, with a lesson, which ambition will never hear; "His ita transactis . . . obiit."

[2] After the Gothic victory, Clovis made rich offerings to St. Martin of Tours. He wished to redeem his war-horse by the gift of 100 pieces of gold; but the enchanted steed could not move from the stable till the price of his redemption had been doubled. This *miracle* provoked the king to exclaim, Vere B. Martinus est bonus in auxilio, sed carus in negotio (Gesta Francorum, ii. 554.).

[3] Epistle from pope Anastasius to the royal convert (iv. p. 50.). Avitus, bishop of Vienna, addressed Clovis on the same subject (p. 49.); and many of the Latin bishops would assure him of their joy and attachment.

troduced an equal and honourable union. The Franks esteemed the valour of the Armoricans,[1] and the Armoricans were reconciled by the religion of the Franks. The military force, which had been stationed for the defence of Gaul, consisted of 100 different bands of cavalry or infantry; and these troops, while they assumed the title and privileges of Roman soldiers, were renewed by an incessant supply of the Barbarian youth. The extreme fortifications, and scattered fragments, of the empire, were still defended by their hopeless courage. But their retreat was intercepted, and their communication was impracticable: they were abandoned by the Greek princes of Constantinople, and they piously disclaimed all connexion with the Arian usurpers of Gaul. They accepted, without shame or reluctance, the generous capitulation, which was proposed by a Catholic hero; and this spurious, or legitimate, progeny of the Roman legions, was distinguished in the succeeding age by their arms, their ensigns, and their peculiar dress and institutions. But the national strength was increased by these powerful and voluntary accessions; and the neighbouring kingdoms dreaded the numbers, as well as the spirit, of the Franks. The reduction of the Northern provinces of Gaul, instead of being decided by the chance of a single battle, appears to have been slowly effected by the gradual operation of war and treaty; and Clovis acquired each object of his ambition, by such efforts, or such concessions, as were adequate to its real value. *His* savage character, and the virtues of Henry IV. suggest the most opposite ideas of human nature: yet some resemblance may be found in the situation of two princes, who conquered France by their valour, their policy, and the merits of a seasonable conversion.[2]

The kingdom (A.D. 499) of the Burgundians, which was defined by the course of two Gallic rivers, the Saone and the Rhône, extended from the forest of Vosges to the Alps and the sea of Marseilles.[3] The sceptre was in the hands of Gundobald. That valiant and ambitious prince had reduced the number of royal candidates by the death of two brothers, one of whom was the father of Clotilda;[4] but his imperfect prudence still permitted Godegesil, the youngest of his brothers, to possess the dependent principality of Geneva. The Arian monarch was justly alarmed by the satisfaction, and the hopes, which seemed to

[1] Instead of the Αρβορυχοι, an unknown people, who now appear in the text of Procopius, Adrian de Valois has restored the proper name of the Αρμορυχοι; and this easy correction has been almost universally approved. Yet an unprejudiced reader would naturally suppose, that Procopius means to describe a tribe of Germans in the alliance of Rome; and not a confederacy of Gallic cities, which had revolted from the empire.

[2] This important digression of Procop. (de Bell. Goth. l. i. c. 12. ii. 29.) illustrates the origin of the French monarchy. Yet I must observe, 1. That the Greek historian betrays an inexcusable ignorance of the geography of the West: 2. That these treaties and privileges, which should leave some lasting traces, are totally invisible in Greg. of Tours, the Salic laws, &c.

[3] Regnum circa Rhodanum aut Ararim cum provinciâ Massiliensi retinebant. Greg. Turon. l. ii. c. 32. ii. 178. The province of Marseilles, as far as the Durance, was afterwards ceded to the Ostrogoths: and the signatures of twenty-five bishops are supposed to represent the kingdom of Burgundy, A.D. 519. (Concil. Epaon. iv. 104.). Yet I would except Vindonissa. The bishop, who lived under the Pagan Alemanni, would naturally resort to the synods of the next Christian kingdom. Mascou (in his four first annotations) has explained many circumstances relative to the Burgundian monarchy.

[4] Mascou (Hist. of the Germans, xi. 10.), who very reasonably distrusts the testimony of Gregory of Tours, has produced a passage from Avitus (epist. v.), to prove that Gundobald affected to deplore the tragic event, which his subjects affected to applaud.

animate his clergy and people, after the conversion of Clovis; and Gundobald convened at Lyons an assembly of his bishops, to reconcile, if it were possible, their religious and political discontents. A vain conference was agitated between the two factions. The Arians upbraided the Catholics with the worship of three Gods: the Catholics defended their cause by theological distinctions; and the usual arguments, objections, and replies, were reverberated with obstinate clamour; till the king revealed his secret apprehensions, by an abrupt but decisive question, which he addressed to the orthodox bishops. "If you truly profess the Christian religion, why do you not restrain the king of the "Franks? He has declared war against me, and forms alliances with "my enemies for my destruction. A sanguinary and covetous mind "is not the symptom of a sincere conversion: let him show his faith "by his works." The answer of Avitus, bishop of Vienna, who spoke in the name of his brethren, was delivered with the voice and countenance of an angel. "We are ignorant of the motives and intentions "of the king of the Franks: but we are taught by Scripture, that the "kingdoms which abandon the divine law, are frequently subverted; "and that enemies will arise on every side against those who have "made God their enemy. Return, with thy people, to the law of God, "and he will give peace and security to thy dominions." The king of Burgundy, who was not prepared to accept the condition, which the Catholics considered as essential to the treaty, delayed and dismissed the ecclesiastical conference; after reproaching his bishops, that Clovis, their friend and proselyte, had privately tempted the allegiance of his brother.[1]

The allegiance of his brother was already seduced; and the obedience of Godegesil, who joined the royal standard with the troops of Geneva, more effectually promoted the success of the conspiracy. While the Franks and Burgundians contended with equal valour, his seasonable desertion decided the event of the battle; and as Gundobald was faintly supported by the disaffected Gauls, he yielded (A.D. 500) to the arms of Clovis, and hastily retreated from the field, which appears to have been situate between Langres and Dijon. He distrusted the strength of Dijon, a quadrangular fortress, encompassed by two rivers, and by a wall 30 feet high, and 15 thick, with 4 gates, and 33 towers:[2] he abandoned to the pursuit of Clovis the important cities of Lyons and Vienna; and Gundobald still fled with precipitation, till he had reached Avignon, at the distance of 250 miles from the field of battle. A long siege, and an artful negociation, admonished the king of the Franks of the danger and difficulty of his enterprise. He imposed a tribute on the Burgundian prince, compelled him to pardon and reward his brother's treachery, and proudly returned to his own dominions, with the spoils and captives of the southern provinces. This splendid triumph was soon clouded by the intelligence,

[1] See the original conference (iv. 99.). Avitus, the principal actor, and probably the secretary of the meeting, was bishop of Vienna. A short account of his person and works may be found in Dupin (Biblio. Eccles. v. 5.).

[2] Greg. of Tours (l. 9. c. iii. ii. 197.) indulges his genius, or rather transcribes some more eloquent writer, in the description of Dijon: a castle, which already deserved the title of a city. It depended on the bishops of Langres till the twelfth century, and afterwards became the capital of the dukes of Burgundy. Longuerue, Descrip. de la France, part i. 280.

that Gundobald had violated his recent obligations, and that the unfortunate Godegesil, who was left at Vienna with a garrison of 5000 Franks,[1] had been besieged, surprised, and massacred by his inhuman brother. Such an outrage might have exasperated the patience of the most peaceful sovereign; yet the conqueror of Gaul dissembled the injury, released the tribute, and accepted the alliance, and military service, of the king of Burgundy. Clovis no longer possessed those advantages which had assured the success of the preceding war; and his rival, instructed by adversity, had found new resources in the affections of his people. The Gauls or Romans applauded the mild and impartial laws of Gundobald, which almost raised them to the same level with their conquerors. The bishops were reconciled, and flattered, by the hopes, which he artfully suggested, of his approaching conversion; and though he eluded their accomplishment to the last moment of his life, his moderation secured the peace, and suspended the ruin, of the kingdom of Burgundy.[2]

I am impatient to pursue the final ruin of that kingdom, which was accomplished (A.D. 532) under the reign of Sigismond, the son of Gundobald. The Catholic Sigismond has acquired the honours of a saint and martyr;[3] but the hands of the royal saint were stained with the blood of his innocent son, whom he inhumanly sacrificed to the pride and resentment of a stepmother. He soon discovered his error, and bewailed the irreparable loss. While Sigismond embraced the corpse of the unfortunate youth, he received a severe admonition from one of his attendants: "It is not his situation, O king! "it is thine which deserves pity and lamentation." The reproaches of a guilty conscience were alleviated, however, by his liberal donations to the monastery of Agaunum, or St. Maurice, in Vallais; which he himself had founded in honour of the imaginary martyrs of the Thebæan legion.[4] A full chorus of perpetual psalmody was instituted by the pious king; he assiduously practised the austere devotion of the monks; and it was his humble prayer, that Heaven would inflict in this world the punishment of his sins. His prayer was heard: the avengers were at hand; and the provinces of Burgundy were overwhelmed by an army of victorious Franks. After the event of an unsuccessful battle, Sigismond, who wished to protract his life that he might prolong his penance, concealed himself in the desert in a religious habit, till he was discovered and betrayed by his subjects,

[1] The Epitomizer of Greg. of Tours (ii. 401.) has supplied this number of Franks; but he rashly supposes that they were cut in pieces by Gundobald. The prudent Burgundian spared the soldiers of Clovis, and sent these captives to the king of the Visigoths, who settled them in the territory of Thoulouse.

[2] In this Burgundian war I have followed Gregory of Tours (l. ii. c. 32, 33. ii. 178.), whose narrative *appears* so incompatible with that of Procop. (de Bell. Goth. l. i. c. 12. ii. 31.), that some critics have supposed *two* different wars. Dubos (Hist. Crit. ii. 126.) has distinctly represented the causes and the events.

[3] See his life or legend (iii. 402.). A martyr! how strangely has that word been distorted from its original sense of a common witness. St. Sigismond was remarkable for the cure of fevers.

[4] Before the end of the fifth century, the church of St. Maurice, and his Thebæan legion, had rendered Agaunum a place of devout pilgrimage. A community of both sexes had introduced some deeds of darkness, which were abolished (A.D. 515) by the regular monastery of Sigismond. Within fifty years his *angels of light* made a nocturnal sally to murder their bishop, and his clergy. Biblio. Raison. (xxxvi. 435—438.) the curious remark of a learned librarian of Geneva.

who solicited the favour of their new masters. The captive monarch, with his wife and two children, was transported to Orleans, and buried alive in a deep well, by the stern command of the sons of Clovis; whose cruelty might derive some excuse from the maxims and examples of their barbarous age. Their ambition, which urged them to achieve the conquest of Burgundy, was inflamed, or disguised, by filial piety: and Clotilda, whose sanctity did not consist in the forgiveness of injuries, pressed them to revenge her father's death on the family of his assassin. The rebellious Burgundians, for they attempted to break their chains, were still permitted to enjoy their national laws under the obligation of tribute and military service; and the Merovingian princes peaceably reigned over a kingdom, whose glory and greatness had been first overthrown by the arms of Clovis.[1]

The first victory of Clovis had insulted the honour of the Goths. They viewed his rapid progress with jealousy and terror; and the youthful fame of Alaric was oppressed by the more potent genius of his rival. Some disputes inevitably arose on the edge of their contiguous dominions; and after the delays of fruitless negociation, a personal interview of the two kings was proposed and accepted. This conference of Clovis and Alaric was held in a small island of the Loire, near Amboise. They embraced, familiarly conversed, and feasted together; and separated with the warmest professions of peace, and brotherly love. But their apparent confidence concealed a dark suspicion of hostile and treacherous designs; and their mutual complaints solicited, eluded, and disclaimed, a final arbitration. At Paris, which he already considered as his royal seat, Clovis (A.D. 507) declared to an assembly of the princes and warriors, the pretence, and the motive, of a Gothic war. "It grieves me to see that the Arians "still possess the fairest portion of Gaul. Let us march against them "with the aid of God; and, having vanquished the heretics, we will "possess, and divide, their fertile provinces."[2] The Franks, who were inspired by hereditary valour and recent zeal, applauded the generous design of their monarch; expressed their resolution to conquer or die, since death and conquest would be equally profitable; and solemnly protested they would never shave their beards, till victory should absolve them from that inconvenient vow. The enterprise was promoted by the public, or private, exhortations of Clotilda. She reminded her husband, how effectually some pious foundation would propitiate the Deity, and his servants: and the Christian hero, darting his battle-axe with a skilful and nervous hand, "There (said he), on "that spot where my *Francisca*[3] shall fall, will I erect a church in

[1] Marius, bishop of Avenche (Chron. ii. 15.) has marked the authentic dates, and Greg. of Tours (l. iii. c. 5, 6. ii. 188.) has expressed the principal facts, of the life of Sigismond, and the conquest of Burgundy. Procop. (ii. 34.) and Agathias (ii. 49.) show their remote and imperfect knowledge.

[2] Greg. of Tours (l. ii. c. 37. ii. 181.) inserts the short but persuasive speech of Clovis. Valde moleste fero, quod hi Ariani partem teneant Galliarum (the author of the Gesta Francorum, ii. 553. adds the precious epithet of *optimam*), eamus cum Dei adjutorio, et, superatis eis, redigamus terram in ditionem nostram.

[3] Tunc rex projecit a se in directum Bipennem suam quod est *Francisca*, &c. (Gesta Franc. ii. 554.). The form and use of this weapon are clearly described by Procop. (ii. 371.). Examples of its *national* appellation in Latin and French, may be found in the Glossary of Ducange, and the large Dictionnaire de Trevoux.

'honour of the holy apostles." This ostentatious piety confirmed and justified the attachment of the Catholics, with whom he secretly corresponded; and their devout wishes were gradually ripened into a formidable conspiracy. The people of Aquitain was alarmed by the indiscreet reproaches of their Gothic tyrants, who justly accused them of preferring the dominion of the Franks; and their zealous adherent Quintianus, bishop of Rodez,[1] preached more forcibly in his exile than in his diocese. To resist these foreign and domestic enemies, who were fortified by the alliance of the Burgundians, Alaric collected his troops, far more numerous than the military powers of Clovis. The Visigoths resumed the exercise of arms, which they had neglected in a long and luxurious peace:[2] a select band of valiant and robust slaves attended their masters to the field;[3] and the cities of Gaul were compelled to furnish their doubtful and reluctant aid. Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, who reigned in Italy, had laboured to maintain the tranquillity of Gaul; and he assumed, or affected for that purpose, the impartial character of a mediator. But the sagacious monarch dreaded the rising empire of Clovis, and he was firmly engaged to support the national and religious cause of the Goths.

The accidental, or artificial, prodigies which adorned the expedition of Clovis, were accepted by a superstitious age, as the manifest declaration of the Divine favour. He marched (A.D. 507) from Paris; and as he proceeded with decent reverence through the holy diocese of Tours, his anxiety tempted him to consult the shrine of St. Martin, the sanctuary and the oracle of Gaul. His messengers were instructed to remark the words of the Psalm, which should happen to be chaunted at the precise moment when they entered the church. Those words most fortunately expressed the valour and victory of the champions of Heaven, and the application was easily transferred to the new Joshua, the new Gideon, who went forth to battle against the enemies of the Lord.[4] Orleans secured to the Franks a bridge on the Loire: but, at the distance of 40 miles from Poitiers, their progress was intercepted by an extraordinary swell of the river Vigenna, or Vienne; and the opposite banks were covered by the encampment of the Visigoths. Delay must be always dangerous to Barbarians, who consume the country through which they march; and had Clovis possessed leisure and materials, it might have been impracticable to construct a bridge, or to force a passage, in the face of a superior enemy. But the affectionate peasants, who were impatient to welcome

[1] It is singular enough, that some important and authentic facts should be found in a Life of Quintianus, composed in rhyme in the old *Patois* of Rouergue (Dubos, Hist. Critiq. ii. 179.).

[2] Quamvis fortitudini vestræ confidentiam tribuat parentum vestrorum innumerabilis multitudo; quamvis Attilam potentem reminiscamini Visigotharum viribus inclinatum; tamen quia populorum ferocia corda longâ pace mollescunt, cavere subito in aleam mittere, quos constat tantis temporibus exercitia non habere. Such was the salutary, but fruitless, advice of peace, of reason, and of Theodoric (Cassiodor. l. iii. ep. 2.).

[3] Montesquieu (Esprit des Loix, l. xv. c. 14.) mentions and approves the law of the Visigoths (l. ix. tit. 2. iv. 425), which obliged all masters to arm, and send or lead into the field, a tenth of their slaves.

[4] This mode of divination, by accepting as an omen the first sacred words, which in particular circumstances should be presented to the eye or ear, was derived from the Pagans; and the Psalter, or Bible, was substituted to the Poems of Homer and Virgil. From the fourth to the fourteenth century, these *sortes sanctorum*, as they are styled, were repeatedly condemned by the decrees of councils, and repeatedly practised by kings, bishops, and saints. See a curious dissertation of the Abbé du Resnel, in Mem. de l'Acad. xix. 287.

their deliverer, could easily betray some unknown, or unguarded, ford; the merit of the discovery was enhanced by the useful interposition of fraud or fiction; and a white hart, of singular size and beauty, appeared to guide and animate the march of the Catholic army. The counsels of the Visigoths were irresolute and distracted. A crowd of impatient warriors, presumptuous in their strength, and disdaining to fly before the robbers of Germany, excited Alaric to assert in arms the name and blood of the conqueror of Rome. The advice of the graver chieftains pressed him to elude the first ardour of the Franks; and to expect, in the southern provinces of Gaul, the veteran and victorious Ostrogoths, whom the king of Italy had already sent to his assistance. The decisive moments were wasted in idle deliberation; the Goths too hastily abandoned, perhaps, an advantageous post; and the opportunity of a secure retreat was lost by their slow and disorderly motions. After Clovis had passed the ford, as it is still named, of the *Hart*, he advanced with bold and hasty steps to prevent the escape of the enemy. His nocturnal march was directed by a flaming meteor, suspended in the air above the cathedral of Poitiers; and this signal, which might be previously concerted with the orthodox successor of St. Hilary, was compared to the column of fire that guided the Israelites in the desert. At the third hour of the day, about ten miles beyond Poitiers, Clovis overtook, and instantly attacked, the Gothic army; whose defeat was already prepared by terror and confusion. Yet they rallied in their extreme distress, and the martial youths, who had clamorously demanded the battle, refused to survive the ignominy of flight. The two kings encountered each other in single combat. Alaric fell by the hand of his rival; and the victorious Frank was saved by the goodness of his cuirass, and the vigour of his horse, from the spears of two desperate Goths, who furiously rode against him, to revenge the death of their sovereign. The vague expression of a mountain of the slain, serves to indicate a cruel, though indefinite, slaughter; but Gregory has carefully observed, that his valiant countryman Apollinaris, the son of Sidonius, lost his life at the head of the nobles of Auvergne. Perhaps these suspected Catholics had been maliciously exposed to the blind assault of the enemy; and perhaps the influence of religion was superseded by personal attachment, or military honour.[1]

Such is the empire of Fortune (if we may still disguise our ignorance under that popular name), that it is almost equally difficult to foresee the events of war, or to explain their various consequences. A bloody and complete victory has sometimes yielded no more than the possession of the field; and the loss of 10,000 men has sometimes been sufficient to destroy, in a single day, the work of ages. The decisive battle of Poitiers was followed by the conquest (A.D. 508) of Aquitain. Alaric had left behind him an infant son, a bastard competitor, factious nobles, and a disloyal people; and the remaining

[1] After correcting the text, or excusing the mistake, of Procopius, who places the defeat of Alaric near Carcassone, we may conclude from the evidence of Gregory, Fortunatus, and the author of the Gesta Francorum, that the battle was fought *in campo Vocladensi*, on the banks of the Clain, about ten miles to the south of Poitiers. Clovis overtook and attacked the Visigoths near Vivonne, and the victory was decided near a village still named Champagné St. Hilaire. Dissert. of Le Bœuf, i. 304.

forces of the Goths were oppressed by the general consternation, or opposed to each other in civil discord. The victorious king of the Franks proceeded without delay to the siege of Angoulême. At the sound of his trumpets the walls of the city imitated the example of Jericho, and instantly fell to the ground; a splendid miracle, which may be reduced to the supposition, that some clerical engineers had secretly undermined the foundations of the rampart.[1] At Bordeaux, which had submitted without resistance, Clovis established his winter-quarters; and his prudent economy transported from Thoulouse the royal treasures, which were deposited in the capital of the monarchy. The conqueror penetrated as far as the confines of Spain;[2] restored the honours of the Catholic church; fixed in Aquitain a colony of Franks;[3] and delegated to his lieutenants the easy task of subduing, or extirpating, the nation of the Visigoths. But the Visigoths were protected by the wise and powerful monarch of Italy. While the balance was still equal, Theodoric had perhaps delayed the march of the Ostrogoths; but their strenuous efforts successfully resisted the ambition of Clovis; and the army of the Franks, and their Burgundian allies, was compelled to raise the siege of Arles, with the loss, as it is said, of 30,000 men. These vicissitudes inclined the fierce spirit of Clovis to acquiesce in an advantageous treaty of peace. The Visigoths were suffered to retain the possession of Septimania, a narrow tract of sea-coast, from the Rhône to the Pyrenees; but the ample province of Aquitain, from those mountains to the Loire, was indissolubly united to the kingdom of France.[4]

After the success of the Gothic war, Clovis accepted (A.D. 510) the honours of the Roman consulship. The emperor Anastasius ambitiously bestowed on the most powerful rival of Theodoric, the title and ensigns of that eminent dignity; yet, from some unknown cause, the name of Clovis has not been inscribed in the *Fasti* either of the East or West.[5] On the solemn day, the monarch of Gaul, placing a diadem on his head, was invested in the church of St. Martin, with a purple

[1] Angoulême is in the road from Poitiers to Bordeaux; and although Gregory delays the siege, I can more readily believe that he confounded the order of history, than that Clovis neglected the rules of war.

[2] Pyrenæos montes usque Perpinianum subjecit; is the expression of Rorico, which betrays his recent date; since Perpignan did not exist before the tenth century (Marca Hispanica, p. 458.). This florid and fabulous writer (perhaps a monk of Amiens. Le Bœuf, Mem. de l'Acad. xvii. 228.) relates, in the *allegorical* character of a shepherd, the general history of his countrymen the Franks; but his narrative ends with the death of Clovis.

[3] The author of the Gesta Francorum positively affirms, that Clovis fixed a body of Franks in the Saintonge and Bourdelois: and he is not injudiciously followed by Rorico, electos milites, atque fortissimos, cum parvulis, atque mulieribus. Yet it should seem that they soon mingled with the Romans of Aquitain, till Charlemagne introduced a more numerous and powerful colony (Dubos, Hist. Crit. ii. 215.).

[4] In the composition of the Gothic war, I have used the following materials, with due regard to their unequal value. Four epistles from Theodoric king of Italy (Cassiodor. l. iii. epist. 1—4. iv. 3—5.), Procop. (de Bell. Goth. l. i. c. 12. ii. 32.), Greg. of Tours (l. ii. c. 35, 36, 37. ii. 181.), Jornan. (de Reb. Get. c. 58. ii. 28.), Fortunatus (Vit. St. Hilarii, iii. 380.), Isidore (Chron. Goth. ii. 702.), the Epitome of Greg. of Tours (ii. 401.), the author of the Gesta Francorum (ii. 553.), the Fragments of Fredegarius (ii. 463.), Almoin (l. i. c. 20. iii. 41.), and Rorico (l. iv. iii. 14.).

[5] The *Fasti* of Italy would naturally reject a consul, the enemy of their sovereign; but any ingenious hypothesis that might explain the silence of Constantinople and Egypt (Chron. of Marcellinus, and the Paschal), is overturned by the similar silence of Marius, bishop of Avenche, who composed his *Fasti* in the kingdom of Burgundy. If the evidence of Gregory of Tours were less weighty and positive (l. ii. c. 38. ii. 183.), I could believe that Clovis, like Odoacer, received the lasting title and honours of *Patrician* (Pagi Critica, ii. 474.).

tunic and mantle. From thence he proceeded on horseback to the cathedral of Tours; and, as he passed through the streets, profusely scattered, with his own hand, a donative of gold and silver to the joyful multitude, who incessantly repeated their acclamations of *Consul* and *Augustus.* The actual, or legal, authority of Clovis, could not receive any new accessions from the consular dignity. It was a name, a shadow, an empty pageant; and, if the conqueror had been instructed to claim the ancient prerogatives of that high office, they must have expired with the period of its annual duration. But the Romans were disposed to revere, in the person of their master, that antique title, which the emperors condescended to assume: the Barbarian himself seemed to contract a sacred obligation to respect the majesty of the republic; and the successors of Theodosius, by soliciting his friendship, tacitly forgave, and almost ratified, the usurpation of Gaul.

Twenty-five years after the death of Clovis, this important concession was more formally declared, in a treaty between his sons and the emperor Justinian. The Ostrogoths of Italy, unable to defend their distant acquisitions, had resigned to the Franks the cities of Arles and Marseilles: of Arles, still adorned with the seat of a Prætorian præfect; and of Marseilles, enriched by the advantages of trade and navigation.[1] This transaction was confirmed (A.D. 536) by the Imperial authority; and Justinian, generously yielding to the Franks the sovereignty of the countries beyond the Alps, which they already possessed, absolved the provincials from their allegiance; and established on a more lawful, though not more solid, foundation, the throne of the Merovingians.[2] From that æra, they enjoyed the right of celebrating at Arles the games of the Circus; and by a singular privilege, which was denied even to the Persian monarch, the *gold* coin, impressed with their name and image, obtained a legal currency in the empire.[3] A Greek historian of that age has praised the private and public virtues of the Franks, with a partial enthusiasm, which cannot be sufficiently justified by their domestic annals.[4] He celebrates their politeness and urbanity, their regular government, and orthodox religion; and boldly asserts, that these Barbarians could be distinguished only by their dress and language from the subjects of Rome. Perhaps the Franks already displayed the social disposition, and lively graces, which in every age have disguised their vices, and sometimes concealed their intrinsic merit. Perhaps Agathias, and the

[1] Under the Merovingian kings, Marseilles still imported from the East, paper, wine, oil, linen, silk, precious stones, spices, &c. The Gauls, or Franks, traded to Syria, and the Syrians were established in Gaul. M. de Guignes, Mem. de l'Acad. xxxvii. 471.

[2] Ὀυ γαρ ποτε ῳοντο Γαλλιας ξυν τῳ ασφαλει κεκτησθαι φραγγοι, μη του αυτοκρατορος το εργον επισφραγισαντος τουτο γε. This strong declaration of Procop. (de Bell. Goth. l. iii. cap. 33. ii. 41), would almost suffice to justify the Abbé Dubos.

[3] The Franks, who probably used the mints of Treves, Lyons, and Arles, imitated the coinage of the Roman emperors of 72 *solidi*, or pieces to the pound of gold. But as the Franks established only a decuple proportion of gold and silver, ten shillings will be a sufficient valuation of their solidus of gold. It was the common standard of the Barbaric fines, and contained forty *denarii*, or silver threepences. Twelve of these denarii made a *solidus*, or shilling, the twentieth part of the ponderal and numeral *livre*, or pound of silver, which has been so strangely reduced in modern France. Le Blanc Traite Hist. des Monnoyes de France, p. 37.

[4] Agath. ii. 47. Greg. of Tours exhibits a very different picture. Perhaps it would not be easy, within the same historical space, to find more vice and less virtue. We are continually shocked by the union of savage and corrupt manners.

Greeks, were dazzled by the rapid progress of their arms, and the splendour of their empire. Since the conquest of Burgundy, Gaul, except the Gothic province of Septimania, was subject, in its whole extent, to the sons of Clovis. They had extinguished the German kingdom of Thuringia, and their vague dominion penetrated beyond the Rhine, into the heart of their native forests. The Alemanni, and Bavarians, who had occupied the Roman provinces of Rhætia and Noricum, to the south of the Danube, confessed themselves the humble vassals of the Franks; and the feeble barrier of the Alps was incapable of resisting their ambition. When the last survivor of the sons of Clovis united the inheritance and conquests of the Merovingians, his kingdom extended far beyond the limits of modern France. Yet modern France, such has been the progress of arts and policy, far surpasses in wealth, populousness, and power, the spacious but savage realms of Clotaire or Dagobert.[1]

The Franks, or French, are the only people of Europe, who can deduce a perpetual succession from the conquerors of the Western empire. But their conquest of Gaul was followed by ten centuries of anarchy, and ignorance. On the revival of learning, the students who had been formed in the schools of Athens and Rome, disdained their Barbarian ancestors; and a long period elapsed before patient labour could provide the requisite materials to satisfy, or rather to excite, the curiosity of more enlightened times.[2] At length the eye of criticism and philosophy was directed to the antiquities of France; but even philosophers have been tainted by the contagion of prejudice and passion. The most extreme and exclusive systems, of the personal servitude of the Gauls, or of their voluntary and equal alliance with the Franks, have been rashly conceived, and obstinately defended and the intemperate disputants have accused each other of conspiring against the prerogative of the crown, the dignity of the nobles, or the freedom of the people. Yet the sharp conflict has usefully exercised the adverse powers of learning and genius; and each antagonist, alternately vanquished and victorious, has extirpated some ancient errors, and established some interesting truths. An impartial stranger, instructed by their discoveries, their disputes, and even their faults, may describe, from the same original materials, the state of the Roman provincials, after Gaul had submitted to the arms and laws of the Merovingian kings.[3]

The rudest, or the most servile, condition of human society, is regulated however by some fixed and general rules. When Tacitus

[1] M. de Foncemagne has traced, in a correct and elegant dissertation (Mem. de l'Acad. viii. 505.), the extent and limits of the French monarchy.

[2] Dubos (Hist. Crit. i. 29.) has truly and agreeably represented the slow progress of these studies; and he observes, that Gregory of Tours was only once printed before the year 1560. According to the complaint of Heineccius (Opera, Sylloge iii. 248.), Germany received with indifference and contempt the codes of Barbaric laws, which were published by Heroldus, Lindenbrogius, &c. At present those laws (as far as they relate to Gaul), the history of Gregory of Tours, and all the monuments of the Merovingian race, appear in a pure and perfect state, in the first four volumes of the Historians of France.

[3] In the space of 30 years (1728—1765) this interesting subject has been agitated by the free spirit of the Count de Boulainvilliers (Mem. Hist. sur l'Etat de la France, i. 15); the learned ingenuity of Dubos (Hist. Crit. de l'Etabliss. de la Monar. Françoise dans les Gauls, 2 vols. 4to.); the comprehensive genius of the president de Montesquieu (Esprit des Loix, l. xxviii. xxx, xxxi.); and the good sense and diligence of the Abbé de Mably (Observ. sur l'Hist. de France, 2 vols. 12mo.).

surveyed the primitive simplicity of the Germans, he discovered some permanent maxims, or customs, of public and private life, which were preserved by faithful tradition, till the introduction of the art of writing, and of the Latin tongue.[1] Before the election of the Merovingian kings, the most powerful tribe, or nation, of the Franks, appointed four venerable chieftains to compose the *Salic* laws;[2] and their labours were examined and approved in three successive assemblies of the people. After the baptism of Clovis, he reformed several articles that appeared incompatible with Christianity: the Salic law was again amended by his sons; and at length, under the reign of Dagobert, the code was revised and promulgated in its actual form, one hundred years after the establishment of the French monarchy. Within the same period, the customs of the *Ripuarians* were transcribed and published; and Charlemagne himself, the legislator of his age and country, has accurately studied the *two* national laws, which still prevailed among the Franks.[3] The same care was extended to their vassals; and the rude institutions of the *Alemanni* and *Bavarians* were diligently compiled and ratified by the supreme authority of the Merovingian kings. The *Visigoths* and *Burgundians*, whose conquests in Gaul preceded those of the Franks, showed less impatience to attain one of the principal benefits of civilized society. Euric was the first of the Gothic princes who expressed in writing the manners and customs of his people; and the composition of the Burgundian laws was a measure of policy rather than of justice; to alleviate the yoke, and regain the affections, of their Gallic subjects.[4] Thus, by a singular coincidence, the Germans framed their artless institutions, at a time when the elaborate system of Roman jurisprudence was finally consummated. In the Salic laws, and the Pandects of Justinian, we may compare the first rudiments, and the full maturity, of civil wisdom; and whatever prejudices may be suggested in favour of Barbarism, our calmer reflections will ascribe to the Romans the superior advantages, not only of science and reason, but of humanity and justice. Yet the laws of the Barbarians were adapted to their wants and desires, their occupations and their capacity; and they all contributed to preserve the peace, and promote the improvements, of the society for whose use they were originally established. The Merovingians, instead of imposing an uniform rule of conduct on their various subjects, permitted each people, and each family of their empire, freely to enjoy their domestic institutions;[5] nor were the Romans excluded from the common

[1] I have derived much instruction from two learned works of Heineccius, the *History*, and the *Elements*, of the Germanic law. In a judicious preface to the Elements, he considers, and tries to excuse, the defects of that barbarous jurisprudence.

[2] Latin appears to have been the original language of the Salic law. It was probably composed in the beginning of the fifth century, before the æra (A.D. 421.) of the real or fabulous Pharamond. The preface mentions the four Cantons which produced the four legislators; and many provinces, Franconia, Saxony, Hanover, Brabant, &c. have claimed them as their own. Dissertation of Heineccius, de Lege Salicâ, iii. Sylloge iii. 247.

[3] Eginhard, in Vit. Caroli Magni, c. 29. v. 100. By these two laws, most critics understand the Salic and the Ripuarian. The former extended from the Carbonarian forest to the Loire (iv. 151.), and the latter might be obeyed from the same forest to the Rhine (iv. 222.).

[4] Consult the ancient and modern prefaces of the several Codes, in the Hist. of France, vol. iv. The original prologue to the Salic law expresses (though in a foreign dialect) the genuine spirit of the Franks, more forcibly than the ten books of Gregory of Tours.

[5] The Ripuarian law declares, and defines, this indulgence in favour to the plaintiff (tit. xxxi. iv. 240.); and the same toleration is understood, or expressed, in all the Codes, except that

benefits of this legal toleration.[1] The children embraced the *law* of their parents, the wife that of her husband, the freedman that of his patron; and, in all causes, where the parties were of different nations, the plaintiff, or accuser, was obliged to follow the tribunal of the defendant, who may always plead a judicial presumption of right or innocence. A more ample latitude was allowed, if every citizen, in the presence of the judge, might declare the law under which he desired to live, and the national society to which he chose to belong. Such an indulgence would abolish the partial distinctions of victory; and the Roman provincials might patiently acquiesce in the hardships of their condition; since it depended on themselves to assume the privilege, if they dared to assert the character, of free and warlike Barbarians.[2]

When justice inexorably requires the death of a murderer, each private citizen is fortified by the assurance, that the laws, the magistrate, and the whole community, are the guardians of his personal safety. But in the loose society of the Germans, revenge was always honourable, and often meritorious: the independent warrior chastised, or vindicated, with his own hand, the injuries which he had offered, or received; and he had only to dread the resentment of the sons, and kinsmen, of the enemy whom he had sacrificed to his selfish or angry passions. The magistrate, conscious of his weakness, interposed, not to punish, but to reconcile; and he was satisfied if he could persuade, or compel, the contending parties to pay, and to accept, the moderate fine which had been ascertained as the price of blood.[3] The fierce spirit of the Franks would have opposed a more rigorous sentence; the same fierceness despised these ineffectual restraints: and, when their simple manners had been corrupted by the wealth of Gaul, the public peace was continually violated by acts of hasty or deliberate guilt. In every just government, the same penalty is inflicted, or at least is imposed, for the murder of a peasant, or a prince. But the national inequality established by the Franks, in their criminal proceedings, was the last insult and abuse of conquest.[4] In the calm

of the Visigoths of Spain. Tanta diversitas legum (says Agobard, in the ninth century) quanta non solum in regionibus, aut civitatibus, sed etiam in multis domibus habetur. Nam plerumque contingit ut simul eant aut sedeant quinque homines, et nullus eorum communem legem cum altero habeat (vi. 356.). He foolishly proposes to introduce an uniformity of law, as well as of faith.

[1] Inter Romanos negotia causarum Romanis legibus præcipimus terminari. Such are the words of a general constitution promulgated by Clotaire, the son of Clovis, and sole monarch of the Franks (iv. 116.), about the year 560.

[2] This liberty of choice has been aptly deduced (Esprit des Loix. l. xxviii. 2.) from a constitution of Lothaire I. (Leg. Langobard, l. ii. tit. lvii. in Codex Lindebrog. p. 664.): though the example is too recent and partial. From a various reading, in the Salic law (tit. xliv. not xlv.), De Mably (i. 290.) has conjectured, that, at first, a *Barbarian* only, and afterwards any *man* (consequently a Roman) might live according to the law of the Franks. I am sorry to offend this ingenious conjecture by observing, that the stricter sense (*Barbarum*) is expressed in the reformed copy of Charlemagne; which is confirmed by the Royal and Wolfenbuttle MSS. The looser interpretation (*hominem*) is authorised only by the MS. of Fulda, from whence Heroldus published his edition. See the four original texts of the Salic law, iv. 147. 173. 196. 220.

[3] In the heroic times of Greece, the guilt of murder was expiated by a pecuniary satisfaction to the family of the deceased (Feithius Antiq. Homeric. l. ii. c. 8.). Heineccius, in his preface to the Elements of Germanic Law, favourably suggests, that at Rome and Athens homicide was only punished with exile. It is true: but exile was a *capital* punishment for a citizen of Rome or Athens.

[4] This proportion is fixed by the Salic (tit. xliv. iv. 147.) and the Ripuarian (tit. vii. xi. xxxvi. iv. 237.) laws: but the latter does not distinguish any difference of Romans. Yet the

moments of legislation, they solemnly pronounced, that the life of a Roman was of smaller value than that of a Barbarian. The *Antrustion*,[1] a name expressive of the most illustrious birth or dignity among the Franks, was appreciated at the sum of 600 pieces of gold; while the noble provincial, who was admitted to the king's table, might be legally murdered at the expence of 300 pieces. Two hundred were deemed sufficient for a Frank of ordinary condition; but the meaner Romans were exposed to disgrace and danger by a trifling compensation of 100, or even 50, pieces of gold. Had these laws been regulated by any principle of equity or reason, the public protection should have supplied in just proportion the want of personal strength. But the legislator had weighed in the scale, not of justice, but of policy, the loss of a soldier against that of a slave: the head of an insolent and rapacious Barbarian was guarded by an heavy fine; and the slightest aid was afforded to the most defenceless subjects. Time insensibly abated the pride of the conquerors, and the patience of the vanquished; and the boldest citizen was taught by experience, that he might suffer more injuries than he could inflict. As the manners of the Franks became less ferocious, their laws were rendered more severe; and the Merovingian kings attempted to imitate the impartial rigour of the Visigoths and Burgundians.[2] Under the empire of Charlemagne, murder was universally punished with death; and the use of capital punishments has been liberally multiplied in the jurisprudence of modern Europe.[3]

The civil and military professions, which had been separated by Constantine, were again united by the Barbarians. The harsh sound of the Teutonic appellations was mollified into the Latin titles of Duke, of Count, or of Præfect; and the same officer assumed, within his district, the command of the troops, and the administration of justice.[4] But the fierce and illiterate chieftain was seldom qualified to discharge the duties of a judge, which require all the faculties of a philosophic mind, laboriously cultivated by experience and study; and his rude ignorance was compelled to embrace some simple, and visible, methods of ascertaining the cause of justice. In every religion, the Deity has been invoked to confirm the truth, or to punish the falsehood, of human testimony; but this powerful instrument was misap-

orders of the clergy are placed above the Franks themselves, and the Burgundians and Alemanni between the Franks and the Romans.

[1] The *Antrustiones, qui in truste Dominicâ, sunt, leudi, fideles*, undoubtedly represent the first order of Franks; but it is a question whether their rank was personal, or hereditary. De Mably (i. 334.) is not displeased to mortify the pride of birth (Esprit, l. xxx. c. 25.) by dating the *origin* of French nobility from the reign of Clotaire II. (A.D. 615.).

[2] Burgundian laws (tit. ii. iv. 257.), the Code of the Visigoths (l. vi. tit. v. iv. 384.), and the constitution of *Childebert*, not of Paris, but most evidently of Austrasia (iv. 112.). Their premature severity was sometimes rash, and excessive. Childebert condemned not only murderers but robbers; quomodo sine lege involavit, sine lege moriatur; and even the negligent judge was involved in the same sentence. The Visigoths abandoned an unsuccessful surgeon to the family of his deceased patient, ut quod de eo facere voluerint habeant potestatem (l. xi. tit. i. iv. 435.).

[3] Heineccius, vol. vi. the Elementa Juris Germanici, l. ii. ii. No. 261, 262. 280—283. Yet some vestiges of these pecuniary compositions for murder, have been traced in Germany, as late as the sixteenth century.

[4] The whole subject of the Germanic judges, and their jurisdiction, is copiously treated by Heineccius (Element. Jur. Germ. l. iii. No. 1—72.). I cannot find any proof, that, under the Merovingian race, the *scabini*, or assessors, were chosen by the people.

plied, and abused, by the simplicity of the German legislators. The party accused might justify his innocence, by producing before their tribunal a number of friendly witnesses, who solemnly declared their belief, or assurance, that he was not guilty. According to the weight of the charge, this legal number of *compurgators* was multiplied: seventy-two voices were required to absolve an incendiary, or assassin; and when the chastity of a queen of France was suspected, three hundred gallant nobles swore, without hesitation, that the infant prince had been actually begotten by her deceased husband.[1] The sin and scandal of manifest and frequent perjuries engaged the magistrates to remove these dangerous temptations; and to supply the defects of human testimony, by the famous experiments of fire and water. These extraordinary trials were so capriciously contrived, that, in some cases, guilt, and innocence in others, could not be proved without the interposition of a miracle. Such miracles were readily provided by fraud and credulity; the most intricate causes were determined by this easy and infallible method; and the turbulent Barbarians, who might have disdained the sentence of the magistrate, submissively acquiesced in the judgment of God.[2]

But the trials by single combat gradually obtained superior credit and authority, among a warlike people, who could not believe, that a brave man deserved to suffer, or that a coward deserved to live.[3] Both in civil and criminal proceedings, the plaintiff, or accuser, the defendant, or even the witness, were exposed to mortal challenge from the antagonist who was destitute of legal proofs; and it was incumbent on them, either to desert their cause, or publicly to maintain their honour, in the lists of battle. They fought either on foot or on horseback, according to the custom of their nation;[4] and the decision of the sword or lance, was ratified by the sanction of Heaven, of the judge, and of the people. This sanguinary law was introduced into Gaul by the Burgundians; and their legislator Gundobald[5] condescended to answer the complaints and objections of his subject Avitus. "Is it not true," said the king of Burgundy to the bishop, "that the event of national "wars, and private combats, is directed by the judgment of God; and "that his providence awards the victory to the juster cause?" By such prevailing arguments, the absurd and cruel practice of judicial

[1] Greg. Turon. l. viii. c. 9. ii. 316. Montesq. observes (Esprit des Loix, l. xxviii. c. 13.), that the Salic law did not admit these *negative proofs* so universally established in the Barbaric codes. Yet this obscure concubine (Fredegundis), who became the wife of the grandson of Clovis, must have followed the Salic law.

[2] Muratori, in the Antiquities of Italy, has given two Dissertations (xxxviii, xxxix.) on the *judgments of God*. It was expected, that *fire* would not burn the innocent; and that the pure element of *water* would not allow the guilty to sink into its bosom.

[3] Montesq. (Esprit des Loix, l. xxviii. c. 17.) has condescended to explain and excuse "la "maniere de penser de nos peres," on the subject of judicial combats. He follows this strange institution from the age of Gundobald to that of St. Lewis; and the philosopher is sometimes lost in the legal antiquarian.

[4] In a memorable duel at Aix-la-Chapelle (A.D. 820.), before the emperor Lewis the Pious; his biographer observes, secundum legem propriam, utpote quia uterque Gothus erat, equestri pugnâ congressus est (Vit. Lud. Pii, c. 33. vi. 103.). Ermoldus Nigellus (l. iii. 543—628. vi. 48.), who describes the duel, admires the *ars nova* of fighting on horseback, which was unknown to the Franks.

[5] In his original edict, published at Lyons (A.D. 501.), Gundobald establishes and justifies the use of judicial combat (Leg. Burgund. tit. xlv. ii. 267.). Three hundred years afterwards, Agobard, bishop of Lyons, solicited Lewis the Pious to abolish the law of an Arian tyrant (vi 356.). He relates the conversation of Gundobald and Avitus.

duels, which had been peculiar to some tribes of Germany, was propagated and established in all the monarchies of Europe, from Sicily to the Baltic. At the end of ten centuries, the reign of legal violence was not totally extinguished; and the ineffectual censures of saints, of popes, and of synods, may seem to prove, that the influence of superstition is weakened by its unnatural alliance with reason and humanity. The tribunals were stained with the blood, perhaps, of innocent and respectable citizens; the law, which now favours the rich, then yielded to the strong; and the old, the feeble, and the infirm, were condemned, either to renounce their fairest claims and possessions, to sustain the dangers of an unequal conflict,[1] or to trust the doubtful aid of a mercenary champion. This oppressive jurisprudence was imposed on the provincials of Gaul, who complained of any injuries in their persons and property. Whatever might be the strength, or courage, of individuals, the victorious Barbarians excelled in the love and exercise of arms; and the vanquished Roman was unjustly summoned to repeat, in his own person, the bloody contest, which had been already decided against his country.[2]

A devouring host of 120,000 Germans had formerly passed the Rhine under the command of Ariovistus. One third part of the fertile lands of the Sequani was appropriated to their use; and the conqueror soon repeated his oppressive demand of another third, for the accommodation of a new colony of 24,000 Barbarians, whom he had invited to share the rich harvest of Gaul.—*Cæsar de Bell. Gall.* l. i. c. 31. i. 213. At the distance of 500 years, the Visigoths and Burgundians, who revenged the defeat of Ariovistus, usurped the same unequal proportion of *two-thirds* of the subject lands. But this distribution, instead of spreading over the province, may be reasonably confined to the peculiar districts where the victorious people had been planted by their own choice, or by the policy of their leader. In these districts, each Barbarian was connected by the ties of hospitality with some Roman provincial. To this unwelcome guest, the proprietor was compelled to abandon two-thirds of his patrimony: but the German, a shepherd, and a hunter, might sometimes content himself with a spacious range of wood and pasture, and resign the smallest, though most valuable, portion, to the toil of the industrious husbandman.[3] The silence of ancient and authentic testimony has encouraged an opinion, that the rapine of the *Franks* was not moderated, or dis-

[1] "Accidit (says Agobard), ut non solum valentes viribus, sed etiam infirmi et senes lacessantur ad pugnam, etiam pro vilissimis rebus. Quibus foralibus certaminibus contingunt "homicidia injusta; et crudeles ac perversi eventus judiciorum." Like a prudent rhetorician, he suppresses the legal privilege of hiring champions.

[2] Montesq. (Esprit des Loix, xxviii. c. 14.), who understands *why* the judicial combat was admitted by the Burgundians, Ripuarians, Alemanni, Bavarians, Lombards, Thuringians, Frisons, and Saxons, is satisfied (and Agobard seems to countenance the assertion), that it was not allowed by the Salic law. Yet the same custom, at least in cases of treason, is mentioned by Erm. Nigellus (l. iii. 543. vi. 48.), and the anonymous biographer of Lewis the Pious (c. 46. vi. 112.) as the "mos antiquus Francorum, more Francis solito," &c. expressions too general to exclude the noblest of their tribes.

[3] The obscure hints of a division of lands occasionally scattered in the laws of the Burgundians (tit. liv. No 1, 2. iv. 271.) and Visigoths (l. x. tit. i. No. 8, 9. 16. iv. 428.), are skilfully explained by Montesq. (Esprit des Loix, l. xxx. c. 7, 8, 9.). I shall only add, that among the Goths, the division seems to have been ascertained by the judgment of the neighbourhood; that the Barbarians frequently usurped the remaining *third*; and, that the Romans might recover their right unless they were barred by a prescription of fifty years.

guised, by the forms of a legal division; that they dispersed themselves over the provinces of Gaul, without order or control; and that each victorious robber, according to his wants, his avarice, and his strength, measured, with his sword, the extent of his new inheritance. At a distance from their sovereign, the Barbarians might indeed be tempted to exercise such arbitrary depredation; but the firm and artful policy of Clovis must curb a licentious spirit, which would aggravate the misery of the vanquished, whilst it corrupted the union and discipline of the conquerors. The memorable vase of Soissons is a monument, and a pledge, of the regular distribution of the Gallic spoils. It was the duty, and the interest, of Clovis, to provide rewards for a successful army, and settlements for a numerous people; without inflicting any wanton or superfluous injuries on the loyal Catholics of Gaul. The ample fund, which he might lawfully acquire, of the Imperial patrimony, vacant lands, and Gothic usurpations, would diminish the cruel necessity of seizure and confiscation; and the humble provincials would more patiently acquiesce in the equal and regular distribution of their loss.[1]

The wealth of the Merovingian princes consisted in their extensive domain. After the conquest of Gaul, they still delighted in the rustic simplicity of their ancestors: the cities were abandoned to solitude and decay; and their coins, their charters, and their synods, are still inscribed with the names of the villas, or rural palaces, in which they successively resided. One hundred and sixty of these *palaces*, a title which need not excite any unseasonable ideas of art or luxury, were scattered through the provinces of their kingdom; and if some might claim the honours of a fortress, the far greater part could be esteemed only in the light of profitable farms. The mansion of the long-haired kings was surrounded with convenient yards, and stables, for the cattle and the poultry; the garden was planted with useful vegetables; the various trades, the labours of agriculture, and even the arts of hunting and fishing, were exercised by servile hands for the emolument of the sovereign; his magazines were filled with corn and wine, either for sale or consumption; and the whole administration was conducted by the strictest maxims of private economy.[2] This ample patrimony was appropriated to supply the hospitable plenty of Clovis, and his successors; and to reward the fidelity of their brave companions, who, both in peace and war, were devoted to their personal service. Instead of an horse, or a suit of armour, each companion, according to his rank, or merit, or favour, was invested with a *benefice*, the primitive name, and most simple form, of the feudal possessions. These gifts might be resumed at the pleasure of the sovereign; and his feeble prerogative derived some support from the influence of his liberality.

[1] It is singular enough, that Montesq. (Esprit des Loix, l. xxx. c. 7.), and De Mably (Observ. i. 21.) agree in this strange supposition of arbitrary and private rapine. Boulainvilliers (Etat de la France, i. 22, 23.) shows a strong understanding, through a cloud of ignorance and prejudice.

[2] See the rustic edict, or rather code, of Charlemagne, which contains seventy distinct and minute regulations of that great monarch (v. 652.). He requires an account of the horns and skins of the goats, allows his fish to be sold, and carefully directs, that the larger villas (*Capitaneæ*) shall maintain 100 hens and 30 geese; and the smaller (*Mansionales*) 50 hens and 12 geese. Mabillon (de Re Diplom.) has investigated the names, the number, and the situation of the Merovingian villas.

But this dependent tenure was gradually abolished[1] by the independent and rapacious nobles of France, who established the perpetual property, and hereditary succession, of their benefices: a revolution salutary to the earth, which had been injured, or neglected, by its precarious masters.[2] Besides these royal and beneficiary estates, a large proportion had been assigned, in the division of Gaul, of *allodial* and *Salic* lands: they were exempt from tribute, and the Salic lands were equally shared among the male descendants of the Franks.[3]

In the bloody discord, and silent decay, of the Merovingian line, a new order of tyrants arose in the provinces, who, under the appellation of *Seniors*, or Lords, usurped a right to govern, and a licence to oppress, the subjects of their peculiar territory. Their ambition might be checked by the hostile resistance of an equal: but the laws were extinguished; and the sacrilegious Barbarians, who dared to provoke the vengeance of a saint or bishop,[4] would seldom respect the landmarks of a profane and defenceless neighbour. The common, or public, rights of nature, such as they had always been deemed by the Roman jurisprudence (*Heinec. Elem. Jur. Germ.* l. ii. p. 1. No. 8.), were severely restrained by the German conquerors, whose amusement, or rather passion, was the exercise of hunting. The vague dominion, which MAN has assumed over the wild inhabitants of the earth, the air, and the waters, was confined to some fortunate individuals of the human species. Gaul was again overspread with woods; and the animals, who were reserved for the use, or pleasure, of the lord, might ravage, with impunity, the fields of his industrious vassals. The chase was the sacred privilege of the nobles, and their domestic servants. Plebeian transgressors were legally chastised with stripes and imprisonment;[5] but in an age which admitted a slight composition for the life of a citizen, it was a capital crime to destroy a stag or a wild bull within the precincts of the royal forests.[6]

According to the maxims of ancient war, the conqueror became the lawful master of the enemy whom he had subdued and spared:[7] and

[1] From a passage of the Burgundian law (tit. i. No. 4. iv. 257.), it is evident, that a deserving son might expect to hold the lands which his father had received from the royal bounty of Gundobald. The Burgundians would firmly maintain their privilege, and their example might encourage the beneficiaries of France.

[2] The revolutions of the benefices and fiefs are clearly fixed by De Mably. His accurate distinction of *times* gives him a merit to which even Montesquieu is a stranger.

[3] Salic law (tit. lxii. iv. 156.). The origin and nature of these Salic lands, which in times of ignorance were perfectly understood, now perplex our most learned and sagacious critics.

[4] Many of the 206 miracles of St. Martin (Greg. Turon. in Maximâ Bibliot. Patrum, xi. 896.) were repeatedly performed to punish sacrilege. Audite hæc omnes (exclaims the bishop of Tours), potestatem habentes, after relating, how some horses run mad, that had been turned into a sacred meadow.

[5] Jonas, bishop of Orleans (A.D. 821—826. Cave, Hist. Litter. p. 443.) censures the *legal* tyranny of the nobles. Pro feris, quas cura hominum non aluit, sed Deus in commune mortalibus ad utendum concessit, pauperes a potentioribus spoliantur, flagellantur, ergastuliis detruduntur, et multa alia patiuntur. Hoc enim qui faciunt, *lege mundi* se facere juste posse contendant. De Institutione Laicorum, l. ii. c. 23. ap. Thomass. Discip. de l'Eglise, iii. 1348.

[6] On a mere suspicion, Chundo, a chamberlain of Gontran, king of Burgundy, was stoned to death (Greg. Turon. l. x. c. 10. ii. 369.). John of Salisbury (Policrat. l. i. c. 4.) asserts the rights of nature, and exposes the cruel practice of the twelfth century. Heinec. Elem. Jur. Germ. l. ii. 1. No. 51—57.

[7] The custom of enslaving prisoners of war was totally extinguished in the thirteenth century, by the prevailing influence of Christianity; but it might be proved, from frequent passages of Gregory of Tours, &c. that it was practised, without censure, under the Merovingian race; and even Grotius himself (de Jure Belli et Pacis, l. iii. c. 7.), as well as his commentator Barbeyrac, have laboured to reconcile it with the laws of nature and reason.

the fruitful cause of personal slavery, which had been almost suppressed by the peaceful sovereignty of Rome, was again revived and multiplied by the perpetual hostilities of the independent Barbarians. The Goth, the Burgundian, or the Frank, who returned from a successful expedition, dragged after him a long train of sheep, of oxen, and of human captives, whom he treated with the same brutal contempt. The youths of an elegant form and ingenuous aspect, were set apart for the domestic service; a doubtful situation, which alternately exposed them to the favourable, or cruel, impulse of passion. The useful mechanics and servants (smiths, carpenters, taylors, shoemakers, cooks, gardeners, dyers, and workmen in gold and silver, &c.) employed their skill for the use, or profit, of their master. But the Roman captives who were destitute of art, but capable of labour, were condemned, without regard to their former rank, to tend the cattle, and cultivate the lands of the Barbarians. The number of the hereditary bondsmen, who were attached to the Gallic estates, was continually increased by new supplies; and the servile people, according to the situation and temper of their lords, were sometimes raised by precarious indulgence, and more frequently depressed by capricious despotism.[1] An absolute power of life and death was exercised by these lords; and when they married their daughters, a train of useful servants, chained on the waggons to prevent their escape, was sent as a nuptial present into a distant country.[2] The majesty of the Roman laws protected the liberty of each citizen, against the rash effects of his own distress, or despair. But the subjects of the Merovingian kings might alienate their personal freedom; and this act of legal suicide, which was familiarly practised, is expressed in terms most disgraceful and afflicting to the dignity of human nature.[3] The example of the poor, who purchased life by the sacrifice of all that can render life desirable, was gradually imitated by the feeble and the devout, who, in times of public disorder, pusillanimously crowded to shelter themselves under the battlements of a powerful chief, and around the shrine of a popular saint. Their submission was accepted by these temporal, or spiritual, patrons; and the hasty transaction irrecoverably fixed their own condition, and that of their latest posterity. From the reign of Clovis, during five successive centuries, the laws and manners of Gaul uniformly tended to promote the increase, and to confirm the duration, of personal servitude. Time and violence almost obliterated the intermediate ranks of society; and left an obscure and narrow interval between the noble and the slave. This arbitrary and recent division has been transformed by pride and prejudice into a *national* distinction, universally established by the arms and the laws of the Merovingians. The nobles, who claimed their genuine, or fabulous, descent from the independent and victorious

[1] The state, professions, &c. of the German, Italian, and Gallic slaves, during the middle ages, are explained by Heinec. (Elem. Jur. Germ. l. i. No. 28—47.), Muratori (Dissert. xiv, xv.), Ducange (Gloss. sub voce *Servi*), and De Mably (Observ. ii. 3, &c. p. 237, &c.

[2] Greg. of Tours (l. vi. c. 45. ii. 289.) relates a memorable example, in which Chilperic only abused the private rights of a master. Many families, which belonged to his *domus fiscales*, in the neighbourhood of Paris, were forcibly sent away into Spain.

[3] Licentiam habeatis mihi qualemcunque volueritis disciplinam ponere; vel venumdare, aut quod vobis placuerit de me facere. Marculf. Formul. l. ii. 28. iv. 497. The *Formula* of Lindenbrogius (p. 559.), and that of Anjou (p. 565.), are to the same effect. Gregory of Tours (l. vii. c. 45. ii. 311.) speaks of many persons, who sold themselves for bread, in a great famine.

Franks, have asserted, and abused, the indefeasible right of conquest, over a prostrate crowd of slaves and plebeians, to whom they imputed the imaginary disgrace of a Gallic, or Roman, extraction.

The general state and revolutions of *France*, a name which was imposed by the conquerors, may be illustrated by the particular example of a province, a diocese, or a senatorial family. Auvergne had formerly maintained a just pre-eminence among the independent states and cities of Gaul. The brave and numerous inhabitants displayed a singular trophy; the sword of Cæsar himself, which he had lost when he was repulsed before the walls of Gergovia.[1] As the common offspring of Troy, they claimed a fraternal alliance with the Romans;[2] and if each prov ce had imitated the courage and loyalty of Auvergne, the fall of the Western empire might have been prevented, or delayed. They firmly maintained the fidelity which they had reluctantly sworn to the Visigoths; but when their bravest nobles had fallen in the battle of Poitiers, they accepted, without resistance, a victorious and Catholic sovereign. This easy and valuable conquest was achieved, and possessed, by Theodoric, the eldest son of Clovis: but the remote province was separated from his Austrasian dominions, by the intermediate kingdoms of Soissons, Paris, and Orleans, which formed, after their father's death, the inheritance of his three brothers. The king of Paris, Childebert, was tempted by the neighbourhood and beauty of Auvergne.[3] The Upper country, which rises towards the south into the mountains of the Cevennes, presented a rich and various prospect of woods and pastures; the sides of the hills were clothed with vines; and each eminence was crowned with a villa or castle. In the Lower Auvergne, the river Allier flows through the fair and spacious plain of Limagne; and the inexhaustible fertility of the soil supplied, and still supplies, without any interval of repose, the constant repetition of the same harvests.[4] On the false report, that their lawful sovereign had been slain in Germany, the city and diocese of Auvergne were betrayed by the grandson of Sidonius Apollinaris. Childebert enjoyed this clandestine victory; and the free subjects of Theodoric threatened to desert his standard, if he indulged his private resentment, while the nation was engaged in the Burgundian war. But the Franks of Austrasia soon yielded to the persuasive eloquence of their king. "Follow "me," said Theodoric, "into Auvergne: I will lead you into a pro-"vince, where you may acquire gold, silver, slaves, cattle, and precious "apparel, to the full extent of your wishes. I repeat my promise; I "give you the people, and their wealth, as your prey; and you may

[1] When Cæsar saw it, he laughed (Plutarch. in Cæsar. i. 409.): yet he relates his unsuccessful siege of Gergovia, with less frankness than we might expect from a great man to whom victory was familiar. He acknowledges, however, that in one attack he lost 46 centurions and 700 men (Bell. Gall. l. vi. c. 44—53. i. 270.).

[2] Audebant se quondam fratres Latio dicere, et sanguine ab Iliaco populos computare (Sidon. Apollin. l. vii. epist. 7. i. 799.). I am not informed of the degrees and circumstances of this fabulous pedigree.

[3] Either the first, or second, partition among the sons of Clovis, had given Berry to Childebert (Greg. Turon. l. iii. c. 12. ii. 192.). Velim (said he), Arvernam *Lemanem*, quæ tantâ jocunditatis gratiâ refulgere dicitur oculis cernere (l. iii. c. 9. p. 191.). The face of the country was concealed by a thick fog, when the king of Paris made his entry into Clermont.

[4] For the description of Auvergne, see Sidon. (l. iv. epist. 21. i. 793.), with the notes of Savaron and Sirmond (p. 279. and 51. of their respective editions), Boulainvilliers (Etat de la France, ii. p. 242.), and La Longuerue (Descrip. de la France, i. p. 132.).

"transport them at pleasure into your own country." By the execution of this promise, Theodoric justly forfeited the allegiance of a people, whom he devoted to destruction. His troops, reinforced by the fiercest Barbarians of Germany,[1] spread desolation over the fruitful face of Auvergne; and two places only a strong castle and a holy shrine, were saved, or redeemed, from their licentious fury. The castle of Meroliac[2] was seated on a lofty rock, which rose an hundred feet above the surface of the plain; and a large reservoir of fresh water was inclosed, with some arable lands, within the circle of its fortifications. The Franks beheld with envy and despair this impregnable fortress: but they surprised a party of fifty stragglers; and, as they were oppressed by the number of their captives, they fixed, at a trifling ransom, the alternative of life or death for these wretched victims, whom the cruel Barbarians were prepared to massacre on the refusal of the garrison. Another detachment penetrated as far as Brivas, or Brioude, where the inhabitants, with their valuable effects, had taken refuge in the sanctuary of St. Julian. The doors of the church resisted the assault; but a daring soldier entered through a window of the choir, and opened a passage to his companions. The clergy and people, the sacred and the profane spoils, were rudely torn from the altar: and the sacrilegious division was made at a small distance from the town of Brioude. But this act of impiety was severely chastised by the devout son of Clovis. He punished with death the most atrocious offenders; left their secret accomplices to the vengeance of St. Julian; released the captives; restored the plunder; and extended the rights of sanctuary five miles round the sepulchre of the holy martyr.[3]

Before the Austrasian army retreated from Auvergne, Theodoric exacted some pledges of the future loyalty of a people, whose just hatred could be restrained only by their fear. A select band of noble youths, the sons of the principal senators, was delivered to the conqueror, as the hostages of the faith of Childebert, and of their countrymen. On the first rumour of war, or conspiracy, these guiltless youths were reduced to a state of servitude; and one of them, Attalus,[4] whose adventures are more particularly related, kept his master's horses in the diocese of Treves. After a painful search, he was discovered, in this unworthy occupation, by the emissaries of his grandfather, Gregory bishop of Langres; but his offers of ransom were sternly rejected by the avarice of the Barbarian, who required an exorbitant sum of ten pounds of gold for the freedom of his noble captive. His deliverance was effected by the hardy stratagem of Leo, a slave belonging to

[1] Furorem gentium, quæ de ulteriore Rheni amnis parte venerant, superare non poterat (Greg. Turon. l. iv. c. 50. ii. 229.) was the excuse of another king of Austrasia (A.D. 574.), for the ravages which his troops committed in the neighbourhood of Paris.

[2] From the name and situation, the Benedictine editors of Greg. of Tours (ii. 192.) have fixed this fortress at a place named *Castel Merliac*, two miles from Mauriac, in the Upper Auvergne. In this description, I translate *infra* as if I read *intra;* the two prepositions are perpetually confounded by Gregory, or his transcribers; and the sense must always decide.

[3] See these revolutions and wars of Auvergne in Greg. of Tours (l. ii. c. 37. ii. p. 183. and l. iii. c. 9. 12, 13. p. 191, 192. de Miraculis St. Julian. c. 13. ii. 466.). He frequently betrays his extraordinary attention to his native country.

[4] The story of Attalus is related by Greg. of Tours (l. iii. c. 16. ii. 193). His editor, the P. Ruinart, confounds this Attalus, who was a youth (*puer*) in the year 532, with a friend of Sidonius of the same name, who was count of Autun, fifty or sixty years before. Such an error, which cannot be imputed to ignorance, is excused, in some degree, by its own magnitude.

the kitchens of the bishop of Langres.[1] An unknown agent easily introduced him into the same family. The Barbarian purchased Leo for the price of twelve pieces of gold; and was pleased to learn, that he was deeply skilled in the luxury of an episcopal table: "Next "Sunday," said the Frank, "I shall invite my neighbours, and kins- "men. Exert thy art, and force them to confess that they have never "seen, or tasted, such an entertainment, even in the king's house." Leo assured him, that, if he would provide a sufficient quantity of poultry, his wishes should be satisfied. The master, who already aspired to the merit of elegant hospitality, assumed, as his own, the praise which the voracious guests unanimously bestowed on his cook; and the dexterous Leo insensibly acquired the trust and management of his household. After the patient expectation of a whole year, he cautiously whispered his design to Attalus, and exhorted him to prepare for flight in the ensuing night. At the hour of midnight, the intemperate guests retired from table; and the Frank's son-in-law, whom Leo attended to his apartment with a nocturnal potation, condescended to jest on the facility with which he might betray his trust. The intrepid slave, after sustaining this dangerous raillery, entered his master's bed-chamber; removed his spear and shield; silently drew the fleetest horses from the stable; unbarred the ponderous gates; and excited Attalus to save his life and liberty by incessant diligence. Their apprehensions urged them to leave their horses on the banks of the Meuse;[2] they swam the river, wandered three days in the adjacent forest, and subsisted only by the accidental discovery of a wild plum-tree. As they lay concealed in a dark thicket, they heard the noise of horses; they were terrified by the angry countenance of their master, and they anxiously listened to his declaration, that, if he could seize the guilty fugitives, one of them he would cut in pieces with his sword, and would expose the other on a gibbet. At length, Attalus, and his faithful Leo, reached the friendly habitation of a presbyter of Rheims, who recruited their fainting strength with bread and wine, concealed them from the search of their enemy, and safely conducted them, beyond the limits of the Austrasian kingdom, to the episcopal palace of Langres. Gregory embraced his grandson with tears of joy, gratefully delivered Leo, with his whole family, from the yoke of servitude, and bestowed on him the property of a farm, where he might end his days in happiness and freedom. Perhaps this singular adventure, which is marked with so many circumstances of truth and nature, was related by Attalus himself, to his cousin, or nephew, the first historian of the Franks. Gregory of Tours[3] was born about sixty years after the

[1] This Gregory, the great-grandfather of Gregory of Tours (ii. 197. 490.), lived 92 years; of which he passed 40 as count of Autun, and 32 as bishop of Langres. According to the poet Fortunatus, he displayed equal merit in these different stations.

Nobilis antiquâ decurrens prole parentum,
Nobilior gestis, nunc super astra manet.
Arbiter ante ferox, dein pius ipse sacerdos,
Quos domuit judex, fovet amore patris.

[2] As Valois and Ruinart are determined to change the *Mosella* of the text into *Mosa*, it becomes me to acquiesce in the alteration. Yet, after some examination of the topography, I could defend the common reading.

[3] The parents of Gregory (Gregorius Florentius Georgius) were of noble extraction (*natalibus . . . illustres*), and they possessed large estates (*latifundia*) both in Auvergne and Burgundy. He was born in the year 539, was consecrated bishop of Tours in 573, and died in 593, or 595, soon after he had terminated his history. See his Life by Odo, abbot of Clugny (ii. 129), and a new Life in the Mem. de l'Acad. xxvi. 598.

death of Sidonius Apollinaris; and their situation was almost similar, since each of them was a native of Auvergne, a senator, and a bishop. The difference of their style and sentiments may, therefore, express the decay of Gaul; and clearly ascertain how much, in so short a space, the human mind had lost of its energy and refinement.[1]

We are now qualified to despise the opposite and, perhaps, artful misrepresentations, which have softened, or exaggerated, the oppression of the Romans of Gaul under the reign of the Merovingians. The conquerors never promulgated any *universal* edict of servitude, or confiscation: but a degenerate people, who excused their weakness by the specious names of politeness and peace, was exposed to the arms and laws of the ferocious Barbarians, who contemptuously insulted their possessions, their freedom, and their safety. Their personal injuries were partial and irregular; but the great body of the Romans survived the revolution, and still preserved the property, and privileges, of citizens. A large portion of their lands was exacted for the use of the Franks: but they enjoyed the remainder, exempt from tribute;[2] and the same irresistible violence which swept away the arts and manufactures of Gaul, destroyed the elaborate and expensive system of Imperial despotism. The Provincials must frequently deplore the savage jurisprudence of the Salic or Ripuarian laws; but their private life, in the important concerns of marriage, testaments, or inheritance, was still regulated by the Theodosian Code; and a discontented Roman might freely aspire, or descend, to the character and title of a Barbarian. The honours of the state were accessible to his ambition: the education and temper of the Romans more peculiarly qualified them for the offices of civil government; and, as soon as emulation had rekindled their military ardour, they were permitted to march in the ranks, or even at the head, of the victorious Germans. I shall not attempt to enumerate the generals and magistrates, whose names[3] attest the liberal policy of the Merovingians. The supreme command of Burgundy, with the title of Patrician, was successively entrusted to the three Romans; and the last, and most powerful, Mummolus,[4] who alternately saved and disturbed the monarchy, had supplanted his father in the station of count of Autun, and left a treasure of 30 talents of gold, and 250 talents of silver. The fierce and illiterate Barbarians were excluded, during several generations, from the dignities, and even from the orders, of the church.—*Fleury*

[1] Decedente atque immo potius pereunte ab urbibus Gallicanis liberalium culturâ literarum, &c. (præfat. ii. 137.), is the complaint of Gregory himself, which he fully verifies by his own work. His style is equally devoid of eloquence and simplicity. In a conspicuous station he still remained a stranger to his own age and country; and in a prolix work (the five last books contain ten years) he has omitted almost every thing that posterity desires to learn. I have tediously acquired, by a painful perusal, the right of pronouncing this unfavourable sentence.

[2] De Mably (i. 247.) has diligently confirmed this opinion of Montesquin (Esprit des Loix, l. xxx. c. 13.).

[3] Dubos, Hist. Crit. de la Monar. Franç. ii. l. vi. c. 9, 10. The French antiquarians establish as a *principle*, that the Romans and Barbarians may be distinguished by their names. Their names undoubtedly form a reasonable *presumption*; yet in reading Gregory of Tours, I have observed Gondulphus, of Senatorian, or Roman extraction (l. vi. c. 11. ii. 273.); and Claudius, a Barbarian (l. vii. c. 29. p. 303.).

[4] Eunius Mummolus is repeatedly mentioned by Greg. of Tours, from the fourth (c. 42. p. 224.) to the seventh (c. 40. p. 310.) book. The computation by talents is singular enough; but if Gregory attached any meaning to that obsolete word, the treasures of Mummolus must have exceeded £100,000 sterling.

Discours iii. *sur l'Hist. Eccles.* The clergy of Gaul consisted almost entirely of native Provincials; the haughty Franks fell prostrate at the feet of their subjects, who were dignified with the episcopal character; and the power and riches which had been lost in war, were insensibly recovered by superstition.[1] In all temporal affairs, the Theodosian Code was the universal law of the clergy; but the Barbaric jurisprudence had liberally provided for their personal safety: a sub-deacon was equivalent to two Franks; the *antrustion*, and priest, were held in similar estimation; and the life of a bishop was appreciated far above the common standard, at the price of 900 pieces of gold.[2] The Romans communicated to their conquerors the use of the Christian religion and Latin language:[3] but their language and their religion had alike degenerated from the simple purity of the Augustan, and Apostolic, age. The progress of superstition and Barbarism was rapid and universal: the worship of the saints concealed from vulgar eyes the God of the Christians; and the rustic dialect of peasants and soldiers was corrupted by a Teutonic idiom and pronunciation. Yet such intercourse of sacred and social communion, eradicated the distinctions of birth and victory; and the nations of Gaul were gradually confounded under the name and government of the Franks.

The Franks, after they mingled with their Gallic subjects, might have imparted the most valuable of human gifts, a spirit, and system, of constitutional liberty. Under a king hereditary but limited, the chiefs and counsellors might have debated, at Paris, in the palace of the Cæsars: the adjacent field, where the emperors reviewed their mercenary legions, would have admitted the legislative assembly of freemen and warriors; and the rude model, which had been sketched in the woods of Germany,[4] might have been polished and improved by the civil wisdom of the Romans. But the careless Barbarians, secure of their personal independence, disdained the labour of government: the annual assemblies of the month of March were silently abolished; and the nation was separated, and almost dissolved, by the conquest of Gaul.[5] The monarchy was left without any regular establishment of justice, of arms, or of revenue. The successors of Clovis wanted resolution to assume, or strength to exercise, the legislative and executive powers, which the people had abdicated: the royal prerogative was distinguished only by a more ample privilege of rapine and murder; and the love of freedom, so often invigorated and

[1] The bishop of Tours himself has recorded the complaint of Chilperic, the grandson of Clovis. Ecce pauper remansit Fiscus noster; ecce divitiæ nostræ ad ecclesias sunt translatæ: nulli penitus nisi soli Episcopi regnant (l. vi. c. 46. ii. 291.).

[2] Ripuar. Code (tit. xxxvi. iv. 241.). The Salic law does not provide for the safety of the clergy; and we might suppose, on the behalf of the more civilized tribe, that they had not foreseen such an impious act as the murder of a priest. Yet Prætextatus, archbishop of Rouen, was assassinated by the order of queen Fredegundis, before the altar (Greg. Turon. l. viii. c. 31. ii. 326.).

[3] M. Bonamy (Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. xxiv. 582.) has ascertained the *Lingua Romana Rustica,* which, through the medium of the *Romance,* has gradually been polished into the actual form of the French language. Under the Carlovingian race, the kings and nobles of France still understood the dialect of their German ancestors.

[4] Ce beau systeme a été trouvé dans les bois. Montesq. Esprit des Loix, l. xi. c. 6.

[5] De Mably, Observ. i. 34. It should seem that the institution of national assemblies, which are coëval with the French nation, have never been congenial to its temper.

disgraced by private ambition, was reduced, among the licentious Franks, to the contempt of order, and the desire of impunity. Seventy-five years after the death of Clovis, his grandson, Gontran, king of Burgundy, sent an army to invade the Gothic possessions of Septimania, or Languedoc. The troops of Burgundy, Berry, Auvergne, and the adjacent territories, were excited by the hopes of spoil. They marched, without discipline, under the banners of German, or Gallic, counts; their attack was feeble and unsuccessful; but the friendly and hostile provinces were desolated with indiscriminate rage. The corn-fields, the villages, the churches themselves, were consumed by fire; the inhabitants were massacred or dragged into captivity; and, in the disorderly retreat, 5000 of these inhuman savages were destroyed by hunger or intestine discord. When the pious Gontran reproached the guilt, or neglect, of their leaders; and threatened to inflict, not a legal sentence, but instant and arbitrary execution; they accused the universal and incurable corruption of the people. "No one," they said, "any longer fears or respects his king, his duke, or his count. "Each man loves to do evil, and freely indulges his criminal inclina-"tions. The most gentle correction provokes an immediate tumult, "and the rash magistrate, who presumes to censure or restrain his "seditious subjects, seldom escapes alive from their revenge."[1] It has been reserved for the same nation to expose, by their intemperate vices, the most odious abuse of freedom; and to supply its loss by the spirit of honour and humanity, which now alleviates and dignifies their obedience to an absolute sovereign.

The Visigoths had resigned to Clovis the greatest part of their Gallic possessions; but their loss was amply compensated by the easy conquest, and secure enjoyment, of the provinces of Spain. From the monarchy of the Goths, which soon involved the Suevic kingdom of Galicia, the modern Spaniards still derive some national vanity: but the historian of the Roman empire is neither invited, nor compelled, to pursue the obscure and barren series of their annals.[2] The Goths of Spain were separated from the rest of mankind, by the lofty ridge of the Pyrenæan mountains: their manners and institutions, as far as they were common to the Germanic tribes, have been already explained. I have anticipated, in the preceding chapter, the most important of their ecclesiastical events, the fall of Arianism, and the persecution of the Jews: and it only remains to observe some interesting circumstances, which relate to the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of the Spanish kingdom.

After their conversion from idolatry or heresy, the Franks and the Visigoths were disposed to embrace, with equal submission, the inherent evils, and the accidental benefits, of superstition. But the prelates of France, long before the extinction of the Merovingian race,

[1] Greg. of Tours (l. viii. c. 30. ii. 325.) relates, with much indifference, the crimes, the reproof, and the apology. Nullus Regem metuit, nullus Ducem, nullus Comitem reveretur; et si fortassis alicui ista displicent, et ea, pro longævitate vitæ vestræ, emendare conatur, statim seditio in populo, statim tumultus exoritur, et in tantum unusquisque contra seniorem, sævâ intentione grassatur, ut vix se credat evadere, si tandem silere nequiverit.

[2] Spain, in these dark ages, has been peculiarly unfortunate. The Franks had a Gregory of Tours; the Saxons, or Angles, a Bede; the Lombards, a Paul Warnefrid, &c. But the history of the Visigoths is contained in the short and imperfect chronicles of Isidore of Seville, and John of Biclar.

had degenerated into fighting and hunting Barbarians. They disdained the use of synods; forgot the laws of temperance and chastity; and preferred the indulgence of private ambition and luxury, to the general interest of the sacerdotal profession.[1] The bishops of Spain respected themselves, and were respected by the public: their indissoluble union disguised their vices, and confirmed their authority: and the regular discipline of the church introduced peace, order, and stability, into the government of the state. From the reign of Recared, the first Catholic king, to that of Witiza, the immediate predecessor of the unfortunate Roderic, sixteen national councils were successively convened. The six metropolitans, Toledo, Seville, Merida, Braga, Tarragona, and Narbonne, presided according to their respective seniority; the assembly was composed of their suffragan bishops, who appeared in person, or by their proxies; and a place was assigned to the most holy or opulent of the Spanish abbots. During the first three days of the convocation, as long as they agitated the ecclesiastical questions of doctrine and discipline, the laity were excluded from their debates; which were conducted, however, with decent solemnity. But, on the morning of the fourth day, the doors were thrown open for the entrance of the great officers of the palace, the dukes and counts of the provinces, the judges of the cities, and the Gothic nobles: and the decrees of the council were ratified by the consent of the people. The same rules were observed in the provincial assemblies, the annual synods which were empowered to hear complaints, and to redress grievances; and a legal government was supported by the prevailing influence of the Spanish clergy. The bishops, who, in each revolution, were prepared to flatter the victorious, and to insult the prostrate, laboured, with diligence and success, to kindle the flames of persecution, and to exalt the mitre above the crown. Yet the national councils of Toledo, in which the free spirit of the Barbarians was tempered and guided by episcopal policy, have established some prudent laws for the common benefit of the king and people. The vacancy of the throne was supplied by the choice of the bishops and palatines; and, after the failure of the line of Alaric, the regal dignity was still limited to the pure and noble blood of the Goths. The clergy, who anointed their lawful prince, always recommended, and sometimes practised, the duty of allegiance: and the spiritual censures were denounced on the heads of the impious subjects, who should resist his authority, conspire against his life, or violate, by an indecent union, the chastity even of his widow. But the monarch himself, when he ascended the throne, was bound by a reciprocal oath to God and his people, that he would faithfully execute his important trust. The real or imaginary faults of his administration were subject to the control of a powerful aristocracy; and the bishops and palatines were guarded by a fundamental privilege, that they should not be degraded, imprisoned, tortured, nor punished with death, exile, or confiscation, unless by the free and public judgment of their peers.[2]

[1] Such are the complaints of St. Boniface, the apostle of Germany, and the reformer of Gaul (iv. 94.). The fourscore years, which he deplores, of licence and corruption, would seem to insinuate, that the Barbarians were admitted into the clergy about the year 660.

[2] The acts of the councils of Toledo are still the most authentic records of the church and constitution of Spain. The following passages are particularly important (iii. 17, 18. iv. 75.

One of these legislative councils of Toledo examined and ratified the code of laws which had been compiled by a succession of Gothic kings, from the fierce Euric, to the devout Egica. As long as the Visigoths themselves were satisfied with the rude customs of their ancestors, they indulged their subjects of Aquitain and Spain in the enjoyment of the Roman law. Their gradual improvement in arts, in policy, and at length in religion, encouraged them to imitate, and to supersede, these foreign institutions; and to compose a code of civil and criminal jurisprudence, for the use of a great and united people. The same obligations, and the same privileges, were communicated to the nations of the Spanish monarchy: and the conquerors, insensibly renouncing the Teutonic idiom, submitted to the restraints of equity, and exalted the Romans to the participation of freedom. The merit of this impartial policy was enhanced by the situation of Spain, under the reign of the Visigoths. The Provincials were long separated from their Arian masters, by the irreconcileable difference of religion. After the conversion of Recared had removed the prejudices of the Catholics, the coasts, both of the Ocean and Mediterranean, were still possessed by the Eastern emperors; who secretly excited a discontented people, to reject the yoke of the Barbarians, and to assert the name and dignity of Roman citizens. The allegiance of doubtful subjects is indeed most effectually secured by their own persuasion, that they hazard more in a revolt, than they can hope to obtain by a revolution; but it has appeared so natural to oppress those whom we hate and fear, that the contrary system well deserves the praise of wisdom and moderation.[1]

While the kingdoms of the Franks and Visigoths were established in Gaul and Spain, the Saxons achieved the conquest of Britain, the third great diocese of the præfecture of the West. Since Britain was already separated from the Roman empire, I might, without reproach, decline a story, familiar to the most illiterate, and obscure to the most learned, of my readers. The Saxons, who excelled in the use of the oar, or the battle-axe, were ignorant of the art which could alone perpetuate the fame of their exploits: the provincials, relapsing into barbarism, neglected to describe the ruin of their country; and the doubtful tradition was almost extinguished, before the missionaries of Rome restored the light of science and Christianity. The declamations of Gildas, the fragments, or fables, of Nennius, the obscure hints of the Saxon laws and chronicles, and the ecclesiastical tales of the venerable Bede,[2] have been illustrated by the diligence, and sometimes embellished by the fancy, of succeeding writers, whose works I am not

v. 2, 3, 4, 5. 8. vi. 11, 12, 13, 14. 17, 18. vii. 1. xiii. 2, 3. 6.). I have found Mascou (Hist. of the ancient Germans, xv. 29. and Annotations, xxvi. and xxxiii.) and Ferreras (Hist. Gen. de l'Espagne, ii.) very useful and accurate guides.

[1] The Code of the Visigoths, regularly divided into twelve books, has been correctly published by Bouquet (iv. 273.). It has been treated by Montesq. (Esprit des Loix, l. xxviii. c. 1.) with excessive severity. I dislike the style; I detest the superstition; but I shall presume to think, that the civil jurisprudence displays a more civilized and enlightened state of society, than that of the Burgundians, or even of the Lombards.

[2] Gildas de Excid. Britan. c. 11—25. p. 4—9. ed. Gale. Nennius Hist. Brit. c. 28. 35—65. p. 105—115. ed. Gale. Bede Hist. Eccles. Gentis Anglor. l. i. c. 12—16. p. 49—53. c. 22. p. 58. ed. Smith. Chron. Saxonic. p. 11—23, &c. ed. Gibson. The Anglo-Saxon laws were published by Wilkins, London, 1731; and the Leges Wallicæ, by Wotton and Clarke. London, 1730.

ambitious either to censure, or to transcribe.[1] Yet the historian of the empire may be tempted to pursue the revolutions of a Roman province, till it vanishes from his sight; and an Englishman may curiously trace the establishment of the Barbarians, from whom he derives his name, his laws, and perhaps his origin.

About forty years after the dissolution of the Roman government, Vortigern appears to have obtained the supreme, though precarious, command of the princes and cities of Britain. That unfortunate monarch has been almost unanimously condemned for the weak and mischievous policy of inviting[2] a formidable stranger, to repel the vexatious inroads of a domestic foe. His ambassadors are dispatched, by the gravest historians, to the coast of Germany; they address a pathetic oration to the general assembly of the Saxons, and those warlike Barbarians resolve to assist with a fleet and army the suppliants of a distant and unknown island. If Britain had indeed been unknown to the Saxons, the measure of its calamities would have been less complete. But the strength of the Roman government could not always guard the maritime province against the pirates of Germany: the independent and divided states were exposed to their attacks; and the Saxons might sometimes join the Scots and the Picts, in a tacit, or express, confederacy of rapine and destruction. Vortigern could only balance the various perils, which assaulted on every side his throne and his people; and his policy may deserve either praise or excuse, if he preferred the alliance of *those* Barbarians, whose naval power rendered them the most dangerous enemies, and the most serviceable allies. Hengist and Horsa, as they ranged (A.D. 449) along the Eastern coast with three ships, were engaged, by the promise of an ample stipend, to embrace the defence of Britain; and their intrepid valour soon delivered the country from the Caledonian invaders. The isle of Thanet, a secure and fertile district, was allotted for the residence of these German auxiliaries, and they were supplied, according to the treaty, with a plentiful allowance of clothing and provisions. This favourable reception encouraged 5000 warriors to embark with their families in 17 vessels, and the infant power of Hengist was fortified by this strong and seasonable reinforcement. The crafty Barbarian suggested to Vortigern the obvious advantage of fixing, in the neighbourhood of the Picts, a colony of faithful allies: a third fleet of 40 ships, under the command of his son and nephew, sailed from Germany, ravaged the Orkneys, and disembarked a new army on the coast of Northumberland, or Lothian, at the opposite extremity of the devoted land. It was easy to foresee, but it was impossible to prevent, the impending evils. The two nations were soon divided and exasperated by mutual jealousies. The Saxons magnified all that they had done and suffered in the cause of an ungrateful people; while

[1] The laborious Carte, and the ingenious Whitaker, are the two modern writers to whom I am principally indebted. The particular historian of Manchester embraces, under that obscure title, a subject almost as extensive as the general history of England.

[2] This *invitation*, which may derive some countenance from the loose expressions of Gildas and Bede, is framed into a regular story by Witikind, a Saxon monk of the tenth century (Coussin, Hist. de l'Emp. d'Occid. ii. 356.). Rapin, and even Hume, have too freely used this suspicious evidence, without regarding the precise and probable testimony of Nennius: Interea venerunt tres Chiulæ a Germaniâ *in exilio pulsæ*, in quibus erant Hors et Hengist.

the Britons regretted the liberal rewards which could not satisfy the avarice of those haughty mercenaries. The causes of fear and hatred were inflamed into an irreconcileable quarrel. The Saxons flew to arms; and if they perpetrated a treacherous massacre during the security of a feast, they destroyed the reciprocal confidence which sustains the intercourse of peace and war.[1]

Hengist, who boldly aspired to the conquest of Britain, exhorted his countrymen to embrace the glorious opportunity: he painted in lively colours the fertility of the soil, the wealth of the cities, the pusillanimous temper of the natives, and the convenient situation of a spacious solitary island, accessible on all sides to the Saxon fleets. The successive colonies which issued, in the period of a century (A.D. 455—582) from the mouths of the Elbe, the Weser, and the Rhine, were principally composed of three valiant tribes or nations of Germany; the *Jutes*, the *old Saxons*, and the *Angles*. The Jutes, who fought under the peculiar banner of Hengist, assumed the merit of leading their countrymen in the paths of glory, and of erecting, in Kent, the first independent kingdom. The fame of the enterprise was attributed to the primitive Saxons; and the common laws and language of the conquerors are described by the national appellation of a people, which, at the end of 400 years, produced the first monarchs of South Britain. The Angles were distinguished by their numbers and their success; and they claimed the honour of fixing a perpetual name on the country, of which they occupied the most ample portion. The Barbarians, who followed the hopes of rapine either on the land or sea, were insensibly blended with this triple confederacy; the *Frisians*, who had been tempted by their vicinity to the British shores, might balance, during a short space, the strength and reputation of the native Saxons; the *Danes*, the *Prussians*, the *Rugians* are faintly described, and some adventurous *Huns*, who had wandered as far as the Baltic, might embark on board the German vessels, for the conquest of a new world.[2] But this arduous achievement was not prepared or executed by the union of national powers. Each intrepid chieftain, according to the measure of his fame and fortunes, assembled his followers; equipped a fleet of three, or perhaps of sixty, vessels; chose the place of the attack; and conducted his subsequent operations according to the events of the war and the dictates of his private interest. In the invasion of Britain many heroes vanquished and fell; but only seven victorious leaders assumed, or at least maintained, the title of kings. Seven independent thrones, the Saxon Heptarchy, were founded by the conquerors, and seven families, one of which has been continued, by female succession, to our present sovereign, derived their equal and sacred lineage from Woden, the god of war. It has been pretended, that this republic of kings was moderated by a general council and a

[1] Nennius imputes to the Saxons the murder of 300 British chiefs; a crime not unsuitable to their savage manners. But we are not obliged to believe (Geoffrey of Monmouth, l. viii. c. 9—12) that Stonehenge is their monument, which the giants had formerly transported from Africa to Ireland, and which was removed to Britain by the order of Ambrosius, and the art of Merlin.

[2] All these tribes are expressly enumerated by Bede (l. i. c. 15. p. 52. l. v. c. 9. p. 190.), and though I have considered Whitaker's remarks (Hist. of Manchest. ii. 538.), I do not perceive the absurdity of supposing that the Frisians, &c. were mingled with the Anglo-Saxons.

supreme magistrate. But such an artificial scheme of policy is repugnant to the rude and turbulent spirit of the Saxons: their laws are silent; and their imperfect annals afford only a dark and bloody prospect of intestine discord.[1]

A monk, who, in the profound ignorance of human life, has presumed to exercise the office of historian, strangely disfigures the state of Britain at the time of its separation from the Western empire. Gildas (*de Excid. Britann.* c. i. p. 1. ed. Gale) describes in florid language the improvements of agriculture, the foreign trade which flowed with every tide into the Thames and the Severn, the solid and lofty construction of public and private edifices: he accuses the sinful luxury of the British people; of a people, according to the same writer, ignorant of the most simple arts, and incapable, without the aid of the Romans, of providing walls of stone, or weapons of iron, for the defence of their native land.[2] Under the long dominion of the emperors, Britain had been insensibly moulded into the elegant and servile form of a Roman province, whose safety was entrusted to a foreign power. The subjects of Honorius contemplated their new freedom with surprise and terror; they were left destitute of any civil or military constitution; and their uncertain rulers wanted either skill, or courage, or authority, to direct the public force against the common enemy. The introduction of the Saxons betrayed their internal weakness, and degraded the character both of the prince and people. Their consternation magnified the danger; the want of union diminished their resources; and the madness of civil factions was more solicitous to accuse, than to remedy, the evils, which they imputed to the misconduct of their adversaries. Yet the Britons were not ignorant, they could not be ignorant, of the manufacture or the use of arms: the successive and disorderly attacks of the Saxons, allowed them to recover from their amazement, and the prosperous or adverse events of the war added discipline and experience to their native valour.

While the continent of Europe and Africa yielded, without resistance, to the Barbarians, the British island, alone and unaided, maintained a long, a vigorous, though an unsuccessful struggle, against the formidable pirates, who, almost at the same instant, assaulted the Northern, the Eastern, and the Southern coasts. The cities which had been fortified with skill, were defended with resolution; the advantages of ground, hills, forests, and morasses, were diligently improved by the inhabitants; the conquest of each district was purchased with blood; and the defeats of the Saxons are strongly attested by the discreet silence of their annalist. Hengist might hope to achieve the conquest of Britain; but his ambition, in an active reign of 35 years, was confined to the possession of Kent; and the numerous colony which he had planted in the North, was extirpated by the sword of the Britons. The monarchy of the West-Saxons

[1] Bede has enumerated seven kings, two Saxons, a Jute, and four Angles, who successively acquired in the Heptarchy an indefinite supremacy of power and renown. But their reign was the effect, not of law, but of conquest; and he observes, in similar terms, that one of them subdued the Isles of Man and Anglesey; and that another imposed a tribute on the Scots and Picts (Hist. Eccles. l. ii. c. 5. p. 83.).

[2] Whitaker (Hist. of Manchest. ii. 503) has smartly exposed this glaring absurdity, which had passed unnoticed by the general historians, as they were hastening to more interesting and important events.

was laboriously founded by the persevering efforts of three martial generations. The life of Cerdic, one of the bravest of the children of Woden, was consumed in the conquest of Hampshire, and the Isle of Wight; and the loss which he sustained in the battle of Mount Badon, reduced him to a state of inglorious repose. Kenric, his valiant son, advanced into Wiltshire; besieged Salisbury, at that time seated on a commanding eminence; and vanquished an army which advanced to the relief of the city. In the subsequent battle of Marlborough,[1] his British enemies displayed their military science. Their troops were formed in three lines; each line consisted of three distinct bodies, and the cavalry, the archers, and the pikemen, were distributed according to the principles of Roman tactics. The Saxons charged in one weighty column, boldly encountered with their short swords the long lances of the Britons, and maintained an equal conflict till the approach of night. Two decisive victories, the death of three British kings, and the reduction of Cirencester, Bath, and Gloucester, established the fame and power of Ceaulin, the grandson of Cerdic, who carried his victorious arms to the banks of the Severn.

After a war of an hundred years, the independent Britons still occupied the whole extent of the Western coast, from the wall of Antoninus to the extreme promontory of Cornwall; and the principal cities of the inland country still opposed the arms of the Barbarians. Resistance became more languid, as the number and boldness of the assailants continually increased. Winning their way by slow and painful efforts, the Saxons, the Angles, and their various confederates, advanced from the North, from the East, and from the South, till their victorious banners were united in the centre of the island. Beyond the Severn the Britons still asserted their national freedom, which survived the heptarchy, and even the monarchy, of the Saxons. The bravest warriors, who preferred exile to slavery, found a secure refuge in the mountains of Wales: the reluctant submission of Cornwall was delayed for some ages;[2] and a band of fugitives acquired a settlement in Gaul, by their own valour, or the liberality of the Merovingian kings.[3] The Western angle of Armorica acquired the new appellations of *Cornwall*, and the *Lesser Britain;* and the vacant lands of the Osismii were filled by a strange people, who, under the authority of their counts and bishops, preserved the laws and language of their an-

[1] At Beran-birig, or Barbury-castle, near Marlborough. The Saxon chronicle assigns the name and date. Cambden (Britan. i. 128.) ascertains the place; and Henry of Huntingdon (Scriptores post Bedam, p. 314) relates the circumstances of this battle. They are probable and characteristic; and the historians of the twelfth century might consult some materials that no longer exist.

[2] Cornwall was finally subdued by Athelstan (A.D. 927—941.), who planted an English colony at Exeter, and confined the Britons beyond the river Tamar. Will. of Malmsbury, l. ii. in the Script. post Bedam, p. 50. The spirit of the Cornish knights was degraded by servitude; and it should seem, from the Romance of Sir Tristram, that their cowardice was almost proverbial.

[3] The establishment of the Britons in Gaul is proved in the sixth century, by Procopius, Gregory of Tours, the second council of Tours (A.D. 567.), and the least suspicious of their chronicles and lives of saints. The subscription of a bishop of the Britons to the first council of Tours (A.D. 461. or rather 481.), the army of Riothamus, and the loose declamation of Gildas (alii transmarinas petebant regiones, c. 25. p. 8.), may countenance an emigration as early as the middle of the fifth century. Beyond that æra, the Britons of Armorica can be found only in romance; and I am surprised that Whitaker (Genuine Hist. of the Britons, p. 214—221.) should so faithfully transcribe the gross ignorance of Carte, whose venial errors he has so rigorously chastised.

cestors. To the feeble descendants of Clovis and Charlemagne, the Britons of Armorica refused the customary tribute, subdued the neighbouring dioceses of Vannes, Rennes, and Nantes, and formed a powerful, though vassal, state, which has been united to the crown of France.

In a century of perpetual, or at least implacable, war, much courage, and some skill, must have been exerted for the defence of Britain. Yet if the memory of its champions is almost buried in oblivion, we need not repine; since every age, however destitute of science or virtue, sufficiently abounds with acts of blood and military renown. The tomb of Vortimer, the son of Vortigern, was erected on the margin of the sea-shore, as a landmark formidable to the Saxons, whom he had thrice vanquished in the fields of Kent. Ambrosius Aurelian was descended from a noble family of Romans;[2] his modesty was equal to his valour, and his valour, till the last fatal action,[3] was crowned with splendid success. But every British name is effaced by the illustrious name of ARTHUR,[4] the hereditary prince of the Silures, in South Wales, and the elective king or general of the nation. According to the most rational account, he defeated, in twelve successive battles, the Angles of the North, and the Saxons of the West; but the declining age of the hero was embittered by popular ingratitude, and domestic misfortunes. The events of his life are less interesting, than the singular revolutions of his fame. During a period of 500 years the tradition of his exploits was preserved, and rudely embellished, by the obscure bards of Wales and Armorica, who were odious to the Saxons, and unknown to the rest of mankind. The pride and curiosity of the Norman conquerors, prompted them to inquire into the ancient history of Britain: they listened with fond credulity to the tale of Arthur, and eagerly applauded the merit of a prince, who had triumphed over the Saxons, their common enemies. His romance, transcribed in the Latin of Geoffrey of Monmouth, and afterwards translated into the fashionable idiom of the times, was enriched with the various, though incoherent, ornaments, which were familiar to the experience, the learning, or the fancy, of the twelfth century. The progress of a Phrygian colony, from the Tyber to the Thames, was easily engrafted on the fable of the Æneid; and the royal ancestors of Arthur derived their origin from Troy, and claimed their

[1] The antiquities of *Bretagne*, which have been the subject even of political controversy, are illustrated by Adrian Valesius (Notitia Galliarum, sub voce *Britannia Cismarina*, p. 98—100.), M. d'Anville (Not. de l'Anc. Gaule, *Corisopiti, Curiosolites, Osismii, Vorganium*, p. 248. 258. 508. 720. and Etats de l'Eur. p. 76.), Longuerue (Descrip. de la France, i. 84.), and Vertot (Hist. Critiq. de l'Etabliss. des Bretons dans les Gaules, 2 vols. Paris, 1720.). I may assume the merit of examining the original evidence which they have produced.

[2] Bede, who in his Chronicle (p. 28.) places Ambrosius under the reign of Zeno (A.D. 474—491.), observes, that his parents had been "purpurâ induti;" which he explains, in his ecclesiastical history, by "regium nomen et insigne ferentibus" (l. i. c. 16. p. 53.). The expression of Nennius (c. 44. p. 110. ed. Gale) is still more singular, "Unus de *consulibus* gentis Romanicæ est pater meus."

[3] By the unanimous, though doubtful, conjecture of our antiquarians, Ambrosius is confounded with Natanleod, who (A.D. 508.) lost his own life, and 5000 of his subjects, in a battle against Cerdic, the West Saxon (Chron. Saxon. p. 17, 18.).

[4] As I am a stranger to the Welsh bards Myrdhin, Llomarch, and Taliessin, my faith in the existence and exploits of Arthur principally rests on the simple and circumstantial testimony of Nennius (Hist. Brit. c. 62, 63. p. 114.). Whitaker (Hist. of Manch. ii. 31.) has framed an interesting, and even probable, narrative of the wars of Arthur: though it is impossible to allow the reality of the round table.

alliance with the Cæsars. His trophies were decorated with captive provinces, and Imperial titles; and his Danish victories avenged the recent injuries of his country. The gallantry and superstition of the British hero, his feasts and tournaments, and the memorable institution of his Knights of the *Round Table*, were faithfully copied from the reigning manners of chivalry; and the fabulous exploits of Uther's son, appear less incredible, than the adventures which were achieved by the enterprising valour of the Normans. Pilgrimage, and the holy wars, introduced into Europe the specious miracles of Arabian magic. Fairies, and giants, flying dragons, and enchanted palaces, were blended with the more simple fictions of the West; and the fate of Britain depended on the art, or the predictions, of Merlin. Every nation embraced and adorned the popular romance of Arthur, and the Knights of the Round Table: their names were celebrated in Greece and Italy; and the voluminous tales of Sir Lancelot and Sir Tristram were devoutly studied by the princes and nobles, who disregarded the genuine heroes and historians of antiquity. At length the light of science and reason was rekindled; the talisman was broken; the visionary fabric melted into air; and by a natural, though unjust, reverse of the public opinion, the severity of the present age is inclined to question the *existence* of Arthur.[1]

Resistance, if it cannot avert, must increase the miseries of conquest; and conquest has never appeared more dreadful and destructive than in the hands of the Saxons; who hated the valour of their enemies, disdained the faith of treaties, and violated, without remorse, the most sacred objects of the Christian worship. The fields of battle might be traced, almost in every district, by monuments of bones; the fragments of falling towers were stained with blood; the last of the Britons, without distinction of age or sex, was massacred[2] in the ruins of Anderida;[3] and the repetition of such calamities was frequent and familiar under the Saxon heptarchy. The arts and religion, the laws and language, which the Romans had so carefully planted in Britain, were extirpated by their barbarous successors. After the destruction of the principal churches, the bishops, who had declined the crown of martyrdom, retired with the holy relics into Wales and Armorica; the remains of their flocks were left destitute of any spiritual food; the practice, and even the remembrance, of Christianity were abolished; and the British clergy might obtain some comfort from the damnation of the idolatrous strangers. The kings of France maintained the privileges of their Roman subjects; but the ferocious Saxons trampled on the laws of Rome, and of the emperors. The proceedings of civil and criminal jurisdiction, the titles of honour, the forms of office, the

[1] The progress of romance, and the state of learning, in the middle ages, are illustrated by Wharton, with the taste of a poet, and the minute diligence of an antiquarian. I have derived much instruction from the two learned dissertations prefixed to the first volume of his History of English Poetry.

[2] Hoc anno (490) Ælla et Cissa obsederunt Andredes-Ceaster; et interfecerunt omnes qui id incoluerunt; adeo ut ne unus Brito ibi superstes fuerit (Chron. Saxon. p. 15.); an expression more dreadful in its simplicity, than all the vague and tedious lamentations of the British Jeremiah.

[3] Andredes-Ceaster, or Anderida, is placed by Cambden (Britan. i. 258.) at Newenden, in the marshy grounds of Kent, which might be formerly covered by the sea, and on the edge of the great forest (Anderida), which overspread so large a portion of Hampshire and Sussex.

ranks of society, and even the domestic rights of marriage, testament, and inheritance, were finally suppressed; and the indiscriminate crowd of noble and plebeian slaves was governed by the traditionary customs, which had been coarsely framed for the shepherds, and pirates, of Germany. The language of science, of business, and of conversation, which had been introduced by the Romans, was lost in the general desolation. A sufficient number of Latin or Celtic words might be assumed by the Germans, to express their new wants and ideas;[1] but those *illiterate* Pagans preserved and established the use of their national dialect.[2] Almost every name, conspicuous either in the church or state, reveals its Teutonic origin;[3] and the geography of *England* was universally inscribed with foreign characters and appellations. The example of a revolution, so rapid and so complete, may not easily be found; but it will excite a probable suspicion, that the arts of Rome were less deeply rooted in Britain than in Gaul or Spain; and that the native rudeness of the country and its inhabitants, was covered by a thin varnish of Italian manners.

This strange alteration has persuaded historians, and even philosophers, that the provincials of Britain were totally exterminated; and that the vacant land was again peopled by the perpetual influx, and rapid increase, of the German colonies. Three hundred thousand Saxons are *said* to have obeyed the summons of Hengist;[4] the entire emigration of the Angles was attested, in the age of Bede, by the solitude of their native country;[5] and our experience has shown the free propagation of the human race, if they are cast on a fruitful wilderness, where their steps are unconfined, and their subsistence is plentiful. The Saxon kingdoms displayed the face of recent discovery and cultivation: the towns were small, the villages were distant; the husbandry was languid and unskilful; four sheep were equivalent to an acre of the best land;[6] an ample space of wood and morass was resigned to the vague dominion of nature; and the modern bishopric of Durham, the whole territory from the Tyne to the Tees, had returned to its primitive state of a savage and solitary forest.[7] Such imperfect population might have been supplied, in some generations, by the English colonies; but neither reason nor facts can justify the unnatural supposition, that the Saxons of Britain remained alone in

[1] Dr. Johnson affirms, that *few* English words are of British extraction. Mr. Whitaker, who understands the British language, has discovered more than 3000, and actually produces a long and various catalogue (ii. 235.). It is possible, indeed, that many of these words may have been imported from the Latin or Saxon into the native idiom of Britain.

[2] In the beginning of the seventh century, the Franks and the Anglo-Saxons mutually understood each other's language, which was derived from the same Teutonic root (Bede, l. i. c. 25. p. 60.).

[3] After the first generation of Italian, or Scottish, missionaries, the dignities of the church were filled with Saxon proselytes.

[4] Carte's Hist. of England, i. 195. He quotes the British historians; but I much fear, that Geoffrey of Monmouth (l. vi. c. 15.) is his only witness.

[5] Bede, Hist. Eccles. l. i. c. 15. p. 52. The fact is probable, and well attested: yet such was the loose intermixture of the German tribes, that we find, in a subsequent period, the law of the Angli and Warini of Germany (Lindenbrog. Codex, p. 479.).

[6] Henry's useful and laborious History of Great Britain, ii. 388.

[7] Quicquid (says John of Tinemouth) inter Tynam et Tesam fluvios extitit sola eremi vastitudo tunc temporis fuit, et idcirco nullius ditioni servivit, eo quod sola indomitorum et sylvestrium animalium spelunca et habitatio fuit (Carte, i. 195.). From Nicholson (Eng. Hist. Library, p. 65. 98.), I understand, that fair copies of John of Tinemouth's ample Collections are preserved in the libraries of Oxford, Lambeth, &c.

the desert which they had subdued. After the sanguinary Barbarians had secured their dominion, and gratified their revenge, it was their interest to preserve the peasants, as well as the cattle, of the unresisting country. In each successive revolution, the patient herd becomes the property of its new masters; and the salutary compact of food and labour is silently ratified by their mutual necessities. Wilfrid, the apostle of Sussex,[1] accepted from his royal convert the gift of the peninsula of Selsey, near Chichester, with the persons and property of its inhabitants, who then amounted to 87 families. He released them at once from spiritual and temporal bondage; and 250 slaves of both sexes were baptized by their indulgent master. The kingdom of Sussex, which spread from the sea to the Thames, contained 7000 families; 1200 were ascribed to the Isle of Wight; and, if we multiply this vague computation, it may seem probable, that England was cultivated by a million of servants, or *villains*, who were attached to the estates of their arbitrary landlords. The indigent Barbarians were often tempted to sell their children or themselves into perpetual, and even foreign, bondage;[2] yet the special exemptions, which were granted to *national* slaves,[3] sufficiently declare, that they were much less numerous than the strangers and captives, who had lost their liberty, or changed their masters, by the accidents of war. When time and religion had mitigated the fierce spirit of the Anglo-Saxons, the laws encouraged the frequent practice of manumission; and their subjects, of Welsh or Cambrian extraction, assume the respectable station of inferior freemen, possessed of lands, and entitled to the rights of civil society.[4] Such gentle treatment might secure the allegiance of a fierce people, who had been recently subdued on the confines of Wales and Cornwall. The sage Ina, the legislator of Wessex, united the two nations in the bands of domestic alliance; and four British lords of Somersetshire may be honourably distinguished in the court of a Saxon monarch.—*Carte's Hist. of England*, i. 278.

The independent Britons appear to have relapsed into the state of original barbarism, from whence they had been imperfectly reclaimed. Separated by their enemies from the rest of mankind, they soon became an object of scandal and abhorrence to the Catholic world.[5] Christianity was still professed in the mountains of Wales; but the rude schismatics, in the *form* of the clerical tonsure, and in the *day* of the celebration of Easter, obstinately resisted the imperious mandates of the Roman pontiffs. The use of the Latin language was insensibly abolished, and the Britons were deprived of the arts and

[1] See the mission of Wilfrid, &c. in Bede, Hist. Eccles. l. iv. c. 13. 16. p. 155, 156. 159.

[2] From the concurrent testimony of Bede (l. ii. c. 1. p. 78.), and Will. of Malms. (l. iii. 102.), it appears that the Anglo-Saxons, from the first, to the last, age, persisted in this unnatural practice. Their youths were publicly sold in the market of Rome.

[3] According to the laws of Ina, they could not be lawfully sold beyond the seas.

[4] The life of a *Wallus*, or *Cambricus, homo*, who possessed a hyde of land, is fixed at 120 shillings, by the same laws (of Ina, tit. xxxii. Leg. Anglo-Saxon, p. 20.), which allowed 200 shillings for a free Saxon, and 1200 for a Thane (Leg. Anglo-Saxon. p. 71.). We may observe, that these legislators, the West-Saxons and Mercians, continued their British conquests after they became Christians. The laws of the four kings of Kent do not condescend to notice the existence of any subject Britons.

[5] At the conclusion of his history (A.D. 731.), Bede describes the ecclesiastical state of the island, and censures the implacable, though impotent, hatred of the Britons against the English nation, and the Catholic church (l. v. c. 23. p. 219.).

learning which Italy communicated to her Saxon proselytes. In Wales and Armorica, the Celtic tongue, the native idiom of the West, was preserved and propagated; and the *Bards*, who had been the companions of the Druids, were still protected, in the sixteenth century, by the laws of Elizabeth. Their chief, a respectable officer of the courts of Pengwern, or Aberfraw, or Caermarthen, accompanied the king's servants to war: the monarchy of the Britons, which he sung in the front of battle, excited their courage, and justified their depredations; and the songster claimed for his legitimate prize the fairest heifer of the spoil. His subordinate ministers, the masters and disciples of vocal and instrumental music, visited in their respective circuits, the royal, the noble, and the plebeian houses; and the public poverty, almost exhausted by the clergy, was oppressed by the importunate demands of the bards. Their rank and merit were ascertained by solemn trials, and the strong belief of supernatural inspiration exalted the fancy of the poet, and of his audience.[1] The last retreats of Celtic freedom, the extreme territories of Gaul and Britain, were less adapted to agriculture than to pasturage: the wealth of the Britons consisted in their flocks and herds; milk and flesh were their ordinary food; and bread was sometimes esteemed, or rejected, as a foreign luxury. Liberty had peopled the mountains of Wales and the morasses of Armorica: but their populousness has been maliciously ascribed to the loose practice of polygamy; and the houses of these licentious barbarians have been supposed to contain ten wives, and perhaps fifty children.[2] Their disposition was rash and choleric: they were bold in action and in speech;[3] and as they were ignorant of the arts of peace, they alternately indulged their passions in foreign and domestic war. The cavalry of Armorica, the spearmen of Gwent, and the archers of Merioneth, were equally formidable; but their poverty could seldom procure either shields or helmets; and the inconvenient weight would have retarded the speed and agility of their desultory operations. One of the greatest of the English monarchs was requested to satisfy the curiosity of a Greek emperor concerning the state of Britain; and Henry II. could assert, from his personal experience, that Wales was inhabited by a race of naked warriors, who encountered, without fear, the defensive armour of their enemies.[4]

By the revolution of Britain, the limits of science, as well as of empire, were contracted. The dark cloud, which had been cleared by the Phœnician discoveries, and finally dispelled by the arms of Cæsar, again settled on the shores of the Atlantic, and a Roman province was

[1] Pennant's Tour in Wales (426—449.) has furnished me with a curious and interesting account of the Welsh bards. In the year 1568, a session was held at Caerwys by the special command of queen Elizabeth, and regular degrees in vocal and instrumental music were conferred on 55 minstrels. The prize (a silver harp) was adjudged by the Mostyn family.

[2] Regio longe lateque diffusa, milite, magis quam credibile sit, referta. Partibus equidem in illis miles unus quinquaginta generat, sortitus more barbaro denas aut amplius uxores. This reproach of William of Poictiers (Hist. of France, xi. 88.) is disclaimed by the Benedictine editors.

[3] Giraldus Cambrensis confines this gift of bold and ready eloquence to the Romans, the French, and the Britons. The malicious Welshman insinuates, that the English taciturnity might possibly be the effect of their servitude under the Normans.

[4] The picture of Welsh and Armorican manners is drawn from Giraldus (Descript. Cambriæ, c. 6—15. inter Script. Cambden, p. 886.), and the authors quoted by De Vertot (Hist. Crit. ii 259.).

again lost among the fabulous islands of the Ocean. One hundred and fifty years after the reign of Honorius, the gravest historian of the times,[1] describes the wonders of a remote isle, whose eastern and western parts are divided by an antique wall, the boundary of life and death, or, more properly, of truth and fiction. The east is a fair country, inhabited by a civilized people: the air is healthy, the waters are pure and plentiful, and the earth yields her regular and fruitful increase. In the west, beyond the wall, the air is infectious and mortal; the ground is covered with serpents; and this dreary solitude is the region of departed spirits, who are transported from the opposite shores in substantial boats, and by living rowers. Some families of fishermen, the subjects of the Franks, are excused from tribute, in consideration of the mysterious office which is performed by these Charons of the ocean. Each in his turn is summoned, at the hour of midnight, to hear the voices, and even the names, of the Ghosts; he is sensible of their weight, and he feels himself impelled by an unknown, but irresistible power. After this dream of fancy, we read with astonishment, that the name of this island is *Brittia;* that it lies in the ocean, against the mouth of the Rhine, and less than thirty miles from the continent; that it is possessed by three nations, the Frisians, the Angles, and the Britons; and that some Angles had appeared at Constantinople, in the train of the French ambassadors. From these ambassadors Procopius might be informed of a singular, though not improbable, adventure, which announces the spirit, rather than the delicacy, of an English heroine. She had been betrothed to Radiger king of the Varni, a tribe of Germans who touched the ocean and the Rhine; but the perfidious lover was tempted, by motives of policy, to prefer his father's widow, the sister of Theodebert king of the Franks.[2] The forsaken princess of the Angles, instead of bewailing, revenged her disgrace. Her warlike subjects are *said* to have been ignorant of the use, and even of the form, of an horse; but she boldly sailed from Britain to the mouth of the Rhine, with a fleet of 400 ships, and an army of 100,000 men. After the loss of a battle, the captive Radiger implored the mercy of his victorious bride, who generously pardoned his offence, dismissed her rival, and compelled the king of the Varni to discharge with honour and fidelity the duties of an husband.[3] This gallant exploit appears to be the last naval enterprise of the Anglo-Saxons. The arts of navigation, by which they had acquired the empire of Britain and of the sea, were soon neglected by the indolent Barbarians, who supinely renounced all the commercial

[1] Procop. de Bell. Gothic. l. iv. c. 20. p. 620. The Greek historian is himself so confounded by the wonders which he relates, that he weakly attempts to distinguish the islands of *Brittia* and *Britain*, which he has identified by so many inseparable circumstances.

[2] Theodebert, grandson of Clovis, and king of Austrasia, was the most powerful and warlike prince of the age; and this remarkable adventure may be placed between the years 534 and 547, the extreme terms of his reign. His sister Theudechildis retired to Sens, where she founded monasteries, and distributed alms (see the notes of the Benedictine editors, ii. 216.). If we may credit the praises of Fortunatus (l. vi. carm. 5. ii. 507.), Radiger was deprived of a most valuable wife.

[3] Perhaps she was the sister of one of the princes or chiefs of the Angles, who landed in 527, and the following years, between the Humber and the Thames, and gradually founded the kingdoms of East Anglia and Mercia. The English writers are ignorant of her name and existence: but Procopius may have suggested to Rowe the character and situation of Rodugune in the tragedy of the Royal Convert.

advantages of their insular situation. Seven independent kingdoms were agitated by perpetual discord; and the *British world* was seldom connected, either in peace or war, with the nations of the continent.[1]

I have now accomplished the laborious narrative of the decline and fall of the Roman empire, from the fortunate age of Trajan and the Antonines, to its total extinction in the West, about five centuries after the Christian æra. At that unhappy period, the Saxons fiercely struggled with the natives for the possession of Britain: Gaul and Spain were divided between the powerful monarchies of the Franks and Visigoths, and the dependent kingdoms of the Suevi and Burgundians: Africa was exposed to the cruel persecution of the Vandals, and the savage insults of the Moors: Rome and Italy, as far as the banks of the Danube, were afflicted by an army of Barbarian mercenaries, whose lawless tyranny was succeeded by the reign of Theodoric the Ostrogoth. All the subjects of the empire, who, by the use of the Latin language, more particularly deserved the name and privileges of Romans, were oppressed by the disgrace and calamities of foreign conquest; and the victorious nations of Germany established a new system of manners and government in the western countries of Europe. The majesty of Rome was faintly represented by the princes of Constantinople, the feeble and imaginary successors of Augustus. Yet they continued to reign over the East, from the Danube to the Nile and Tigris; the Gothic and Vandal kingdoms of Italy and Africa were subverted by the arms of Justinian; and the history of the *Greek* emperors may still afford a long series of instructive lessons, and interesting revolutions.

General Observations on the Fall of the Roman Empire in the West.

THE Greeks, after their country had been reduced into a province, imputed the triumphs of Rome, not to the merit, but to the FORTUNE, of the republic. The inconstant goddess, who so blindly distributes and resumes her favours, had *now* consented (such was the language of envious flattery) to resign her wings, to descend from her globe, and to fix her firm and immutable throne on the banks of the Tyber.[2] A wiser Greek, who has composed, with a philosophic spirit, the memorable history of his own times, deprived his countrymen of this vain and delusive comfort, by opening to their view the deep foundations of the greatness of Rome.[3] The fidelity of the citizens to each other, and

[1] In the copious history of Gregory of Tours, we cannot find any traces of hostile or friendly intercourse between France and England, except in the marriage of the daughter of Caribert king of Paris, quam regis *cujusdam* in Cantia filius matrimonio copulavit (l. ix. c. 26. ii. 348.). The bishop of Tours ended his history and his life almost immediately before the conversion of Kent.

[2] Such are the figurative expressions of Plutarch (Opera, ii. 318. ed. Wechel), to whom, on the faith of his son Lamprias (Fabric. Biblio. Græc. iii. 341.), I shall boldly impute the malicious declamation, περι της Ρωμαιων τυχης. The same opinions had prevailed among the Greeks 250 years before Plutarch; and to confute them, is the professed intention of Polybius (Hist. l. i. p. 90. ed. Gronov. Amstel. 1670.).

[3] See the inestimable remains of the sixth book of Polybius, and many other parts of his general history, particularly a digression in the seventeenth book, in which he compares the phalanx and the legion.

to the state, was confirmed by the habits of education, and the prejudices of religion. Honour, as well as virtue, was the principle of the republic; the ambitious citizens laboured to deserve the solemn glories of a triumph; and the ardour of the Roman youth was kindled into active emulation, as often as they beheld the domestic images of their ancestors.[1] The temperate struggles of the patricians and plebeians had finally established the firm and equal balance of the constitution; which united the freedom of popular assemblies, with the authority and wisdom of a senate, and the executive powers of a regal magistrate. When the consul displayed the standard of the republic, each citizen bound himself, by the obligation of an oath, to draw his sword in the cause of his country, till he had discharged the sacred duty by a military service of ten years. This wise institution continually poured into the field the rising generations of freemen and soldiers; and their numbers were reinforced by the warlike and populous states of Italy, who, after a brave resistance, had yielded to the valour, and embraced the alliance, of the Romans. The sage historian, who excited the virtue of the younger Scipio, and beheld the ruin of Carthage,[2] has accurately described their military system; their levies, arms, exercises, subordination, marches, encampments; and the invincible legion, superior in active strength to the Macedonian phalanx of Philip and Alexander. From these institutions of peace and war, Polybius has deduced the spirit and success of a people, incapable of fear, and impatient of repose. The ambitious design of conquest, which might have been defeated by the seasonable conspiracy of mankind, was attempted and achieved; and the perpetual violation of justice was maintained by the political virtues of prudence and courage. The arms of the republic, sometimes vanquished in battle, always victorious in war, advanced with rapid steps to the Euphrates, the Danube, the Rhine, and the Ocean; and the images of gold, or silver, or brass, that might serve to represent the nations and their kings, were successively broken by the *iron* monarchy of Rome.[3]

The rise of a city, which swelled into an empire, may deserve, as a singular prodigy, the reflection of a philosophic mind. But the decline of Rome was the natural and inevitable effect of immoderate greatness Prosperity ripened the principle of decay; the causes of destruction multiplied with the extent of conquest; and as soon as time or accident had removed the artificial supports, the stupendous fabric yielded to the pressure of its own weight. The story of its ruin is simple and obvious; and instead of enquiring *why* the Roman empire was destroyed, we should rather be surprised that it had subsisted so long.

[1] Sallust, de Bell. Jugurth. c. 4. Such were the generous professions of P. Scipio and Q. Maximus. The Latin historian had read, and most probably transcribes, Polybius, their contemporary and friend.

[2] While Carthage was in flames, Scipio repeated two lines of the Iliad, which express the destruction of Troy, acknowledged to Polybius, his friend and preceptor (Polyb. in Excerpt. de Virtut. et Vit. ii. 1455.), that while he recollected the vicissitudes of human affairs, he inwardly applied them to the future calamities of Rome (Appian. in Libycis, p. 136. ed. Toll.).

[3] Daniel, ii. 31—40. "And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as *iron;* forasmuch as iron "breaketh in pieces, and subdueth all things." The remainder of the prophecy (the mixture of iron and *clay*) was accomplished, according to St. Jerom, in his own time. Sicut enim in principio nihil Romano Imperio fortius et durius, ita in fine rerum nihil imbecillius: quum et in bellis civilibus et adversus diversas nationes, aliarum gentium barbararum auxilio indigemus (Opera, v. 572.).

The victorious legions, who, in distant wars, acquired the vices of strangers and mercenaries, first oppressed the freedom of the republic, and afterwards violated the majesty of the purple. The emperors, anxious for their personal safety and the public peace, were reduced to the base expedient of corrupting the discipline which rendered them alike formidable to their sovereign and to the enemy; the vigour of the military government was relaxed, and finally dissolved, by the partial institutions of Constantine; and the Roman world was overwhelmed by a deluge of Barbarians.

The decay of Rome has been frequently ascribed to the translation of the seat of Empire; but this history has already shown, that the powers of government were *divided*, rather than *removed*. The throne of Constantinople was erected in the East; while the West was still possessed by a series of emperors who held their residence in Italy, and claimed their equal inheritance of the legions and provinces. This dangerous novelty impaired the strength, and fomented the vices, of a double reign: the instruments of an oppressive and arbitrary system were multiplied; and a vain emulation of luxury, not of merit, was introduced and supported between the degenerate successors of Theodosius. Extreme distress, which unites the virtue of a free people, embitters the factions of a declining monarchy. The hostile favourites of Arcadius and Honorius betrayed the republic to its common enemies; and the Byzantine court beheld with indifference, perhaps with pleasure, the disgrace of Rome, the misfortunes of Italy, and the loss of the West. Under the succeeding reigns, the alliance of the two empires was restored; but the aid of the Oriental Romans was tardy, doubtful, and ineffectual; and the national schism of the Greeks and Latins was enlarged by the perpetual difference of language and manners, of interest, and even of religion. Yet the salutary event approved in some measure the judgment of Constantine. During a long period of decay, his impregnable city repelled the victorious armies of Barbarians, protected the wealth of Asia, and commanded, both in peace and war, the important straits which connect the Euxine and Mediterranean seas. The foundation of Constantinople more essentially contributed to the preservation of the East, than to the ruin of the West.

As the happiness of a *future* life is the great object of religion, we may hear without surprise or scandal, that the abuse of Christianity had some influence on the decline and fall of the Roman empire. The clergy successfully preached the doctrines of patience; and the last remains of military spirit were buried in the cloister: a large portion of public and private wealth was consecrated to the specious demands of charity and devotion; and the soldiers' pay was lavished on useless multitudes of both sexes. Faith, zeal, curiosity, and the more earthly passions of malice and ambition, kindled the flame of theological discord; the church, and even the state, were distracted by religious factions, whose conflicts were sometimes bloody, and always implacable; the attention of the emperors was diverted from camps to synods; the Roman world was oppressed by a new species of tyranny; and the persecuted sects became the secret enemies of their country. Yet party-spirit, however pernicious or absurd, is a principle of union as

well as of dissension. The bishops, from 1800 pulpits, inculcated the duty of passive obedience to a lawful and orthodox sovereign; their frequent assemblies, and perpetual correspondence, maintained the communion of distant churches; and the benevolent temper of the gospel was strengthened, though confined, by the spiritual alliance of the Catholics. The indolence of the monks was devoutly embraced by a servile and effeminate age; but if superstition had not afforded a decent retreat, the same vices would have tempted the unworthy Romans to desert, from baser motives, the standard of the republic. Religious precepts are easily obeyed, which indulge and sanctify the natural inclinations of their votaries; but the pure and genuine influence of Christianity may be traced in its beneficial, though imperfect, effects on the Barbarian proselytes of the North. If the decline of the Roman empire was hastened by the conversion of Constantine, his victorious religion broke the violence of the fall, and mollified the ferocious temper of the conquerors.

This awful revolution may be usefully applied to the instruction of the present age. It is the duty of a patriot to prefer and promote the exclusive interest and glory of his native country: but a philosopher may be permitted to enlarge his views. and to consider Europe as one great republic, whose various inhabitants have attained almost the same level of politeness and cultivation. The balance of power will continue to fluctuate, and the prosperity of our own, or the neighbouring kingdoms, may be alternately exalted or depressed; but these partial events cannot essentially injure our general state of happiness, the system of arts, and laws, and manners, which so advantageously distinguish, above the rest of mankind, the Europeans and their colonies. The savage nations of the globe are the common enemies of civilized society; and we may enquire with anxious curiosity, whether Europe is still threatened with a repetition of those calamities, which formerly oppressed the arms and institutions of Rome. Perhaps the same reflections will illustrate the fall of that mighty empire, and explain the probable causes of our actual security.

I. The Romans were ignorant of the extent of their danger, and the number of their enemies. Beyond the Rhine and Danube, the northern countries of Europe and Asia were filled with innumerable tribes of hunters and shepherds, poor, voracious, and turbulent; bold in arms, and impatient to ravish the fruits of industry. The Barbarian world was agitated by the rapid impulse of war; and the peace of Gaul or Italy was shaken by the distant revolutions of China. The Huns, who fled before a victorious enemy, directed their march towards the West; and the torrent was swelled by the gradual accession of captives and allies. The flying tribes who yielded to the Huns, assumed in *their* turn the spirit of conquest; the endless column of Barbarians pressed on the Roman empire with accumulated weight; and, if the foremost were destroyed, the vacant space was instantly replenished by new assailants. Such formidable emigrations can no longer issue from the North; and the long repose, which has been imputed to the decrease of population, is the happy consequence of the progress of arts and agriculture. Instead of some rude villages, thinly scattered among its woods and morasses, Germany now pro-

duces a list of 2300 walled towns: the Christian kingdoms of Denmark, Sweden, and Poland, have been successively established; and the Hanse merchants, with the Teutonic knights, have extended their colonies along the coast of the Baltic, as far as the Gulf of Finland. From the Gulf of Finland to the Eastern Ocean, Russia now assumes the form of a powerful and civilized empire. The plough, the loom, and the forge are introduced on the banks of the Volga, the Oby, and the Lena; and the fiercest of the Tartar hordes have been taught to tremble and obey. The reign of independent Barbarism is now contracted to a narrow span; and the remnant of Calmucks or Uzbecks, whose forces may be almost numbered, cannot seriously excite the apprehensions of the great republic of Europe.[1] Yet this apparent security should not tempt us to forget that new enemies, and unknown dangers, may *possibly* arise from some obscure people, scarcely visible in the map of the world. The Arabs or Saracens, who spread their conquests from India to Spain, had languished in poverty and contempt, till Mahomet breathed into those savage bodies the soul of enthusiasm.

II. The empire of Rome was firmly established by the singular and perfect coalition of its members. The subject nations, resigning the hope, and even the wish, of independence, embraced the character of Roman citizens; and the provinces of the West were reluctantly torn by the Barbarians from the bosom of their mother-country.[2] But this union was purchased by the loss of national freedom and military spirit; and the servile provinces, destitute of life and motion, expected their safety from the mercenary troops and governors, who were directed by the orders of a distant court. The happiness of an hundred millions depended on the personal merit of one, or two, men, perhaps children, whose minds were corrupted by education, luxury, and despotic power. The deepest wounds were inflicted on the empire during the minorities of the sons and grandsons of Theodosius; and after those incapable princes seemed to attain the age of manhood, they abandoned the church to the bishops, the state to the eunuchs, and the provinces to the Barbarians. Europe is now divided into twelve powerful, though unequal, kingdoms, three respectable common-wealths, and a variety of smaller, though independent, states: the chances of royal and ministerial talents are multiplied, at least, with the number of its rulers; and a Julian, or Semiramis, may reign in the North, while Arcadius and Honorius again slumber on the thrones of the South. The abuses of tyranny are restrained by the mutual influence of fear and shame; republics have acquired order and stability; monarchies have imbibed the principles of freedom, or, at least, of moderation; and some sense of honour and justice is introduced into the most defective constitutions by the general manners

[1] The French and English editors of the Genealog. Hist. of the Tartars have subjoined a curious, though imperfect, description of their present state. We might question the independence of the Calmucks, or Eluths, since they have been recently vanquished by the Chinese, who, in the year 1759, subdued the lesser Bucharia, and advanced into the country of Badakshan, near the sources of the Oxus (Mem. sur les Chinois, i. 325.). But these conquests are precarious, nor will I venture to ensure the safety of the Chinese empire.

[2] The prudent reader will determine how far this general proposition is weakened by the revolt of the Isaurians, the independence of Britain and Armorica, the Moorish tribes, or the Bagaudæ of Gaul and Spain (i. p. 340. iii. p. 273. 337. 434.).

of the times. In peace, the progress of knowledge and industry is accelerated by the emulation of so many active rivals: in war, the European forces are exercised by temperate and undecisive contests. If a savage conqueror should issue from the deserts of Tartary, he must repeatedly vanquish the robust peasants of Russia, the numerous armies of Germany, the gallant nobles of France, and the intrepid freemen of Britain; who, perhaps, might confederate for their common defence. Should the victorious Barbarians carry slavery and desolation as far as the Atlantic Ocean, ten thousand vessels would transport beyond their pursuit the remains of civilized society; and Europe would revive and flourish in the American world, which is already filled with her colonies and institutions.[1]

III. Cold, poverty, and a life of danger and fatigue, fortify the strength and courage of Barbarians. In every age they have oppressed the polite and peaceful nations of China, India, and Persia, who neglected, and still neglect, to counterbalance these natural powers by the resources of military art. The warlike states of antiquity, Greece, Macedonia, and Rome, educated a race of soldiers; exercised their bodies, disciplined their courage, multiplied their forces by regular evolutions, and converted the iron, which they possessed, into strong and serviceable weapons. But this superiority insensibly declined with their laws and manners; and the feeble policy of Constantine and his successors armed and instructed, for the ruin of the empire, the rude valour of the Barbarian mercenaries. The military art has been changed by the invention of gunpowder; which enables man to command the two most powerful agents of nature, air and fire. Mathematics, chymistry, mechanics, architecture, have been applied to the service of war; and the adverse parties oppose to each other the most elaborate modes of attack and of defence. Historians may indignantly observe, that the preparations of a siege would found and maintain a flourishing colony;[2] yet we cannot be displeased, that the subversion of a city should be a work of cost and difficulty; or that an industrious people should be protected by those arts, which survive and supply the decay of military virtue. Cannon and fortifications now form an impregnable barrier against the Tartar horse; and Europe is secure from any future irruption of Barbarians; since, before they can conquer, they must cease to be barbarous. Their gradual advances in the science of war would always be accompanied, as we may learn from the example of Russia, with a proportionable improvement in the arts of peace and civil policy; and they them-

[1] America now contains about six millions of European blood and descent; and their numbers, at least in the North, are continually increasing. Whatever may be the changes of their political situation, they must preserve the manners of Europe; and we may reflect with some pleasure, that the English language will probably be diffused over an immense and populous continent.

[2] On avoit fait venir (for the siege of Turin) 140 pieces de canon; et il est à remarquer que chaque gros canon monté revient à environ 2000 ecus: il y avoit 110,000 boulets; 106,000 cartouches d'un façon, et 300,000 d'une autre; 21,000 bombes; 27,700 grenades, 15,000 sacs à terre, 30,000 instrumens pour le pionnage; 1,200,000 livres de poudre. Ajoutez à ces munitions, le plomb, le fer, et le fer blanc, les cordages, tout ce qui sert aux mineurs, le souphre, le salpêtre, les outils de toute espece. Il est certain que les frais de tous ces préparatifs de destruction suffiroient pour fonder et pour faire fleurir la plus nombreuse colonie. Voltaire, Siècle de Louis XIV. c. xx. in his Works, xi. 391.

selves must deserve a place among the polished nations whom they subdue.

Should these speculations be found doubtful or fallacious, there still remains a more humble source of comfort and hope. The discoveries of ancient and modern navigators, and the domestic history, or tradition, of the most enlightened nations, represent the *human savage*, naked both in mind and body, and destitute of laws, of arts, of ideas, and almost of language.[1] From this abject condition, perhaps the primitive and universal state of man, he has gradually arisen to command the animals, to fertilize the earth, to traverse the ocean, and to measure the heavens. His progress in the improvement and exercise of his mental and corporeal faculties[2] has been irregular and various; infinitely slow in the beginning, and increasing by degrees with redoubled velocity: ages of laborious ascent have been followed by a moment of rapid downfall; and the several climates of the globe have felt the vicissitudes of light and darkness. Yet the experience of four thousand years should enlarge our hopes, and diminish our apprehensions: we cannot determine to what height the human species may aspire in their advances towards perfection; but it may safely be presumed, that no people, unless the face of nature is changed, will relapse into their original barbarism. The improvements of society may be viewed under a threefold aspect. 1. The poet or philosopher illustrates his age and country by the efforts of a *single* mind; but these superior powers of reason or fancy are rare and spontaneous productions; and the genius of Homer, or Cicero, or Newton, would excite less admiration, if they could be created by the will of a prince, or the lessons of a preceptor. 2. The benefits of law and policy, of trade and manufactures, of arts and sciences, are more solid and permanent; and *many* individuals may be qualified, by education and discipline, to promote, in their respective stations, the interest of the community. But this general order is the effect of skill and labour; and the complex machinery may be decayed by time, or injured by violence. 3. Fortunately for mankind, the more useful, or, at least, more necessary arts, can be performed without superior talents, or national subordination; without the powers of *one*, or the union of *many*. Each village, each family, each individual, must always possess both ability and inclination, to perpetuate the use of fire[3] and of metals; the propagation and service of domestic animals; the methods of hunting and fishing; the rudiments of navigation; the imperfect cultivation of corn, or other nutritive grain; and the simple

[1] It would be an easy, though tedious task, to produce the authorities of poets, philosophers, and historians. I shall therefore content myself with appealing to the decisive and authentic testimony of Diodor. Sicul. (i. l. i. p. 11, 12. l. iii. p. 184, &c. ed. Wesseling.). The Icthyophagi, who in his time wandered along the shores of the Red Sea, can only be compared to the natives of New Holland (Dampier's Voyag. i. 464.). Fancy, or perhaps reason, may still suppose an extreme and absolute state of nature far below the level of these savages, who had acquired some arts and instruments.

[2] See the learned and rational work of the President Goguet, de l'Orig. des Loix, des Arts, et des Sciences. He traces from facts, or conjectures (i. 147. ed. 12mo.), the first and most difficult steps of human invention.

[3] It is certain, however strange, that many nations have been ignorant of the use of fire. Even the ingenious natives of Otaheite, who are destitute of metals, have not invented any earthen vessels capable of sustaining the action of fire, and of communicating the heat to the liquids which they contain.

practice of the mechanic trades. Private genius and public industry may be extirpated; but these hardy plants survive the tempest, and strike an everlasting root into the most unfavourable soil. The splendid days of Augustus and Trajan were eclipsed by a cloud of ignorance; and the Barbarians subverted the laws and palaces of Rome. But the scythe, the invention or emblem of Saturn,[1] still continued annually to mow the harvests of Italy; and the human feasts of the Læstrigons[2] have never been renewed on the coast of Campania.

Since the first discovery of the arts, war, commerce, and religious zeal have diffused, among the savages of the Old and New World, these inestimable gifts: they have been successively propagated; they can never be lost. We may therefore acquiesce in the pleasing conclusion, that every age of the world has increased, and still increases, the real wealth, the happiness, the knowledge, and perhaps the virtue, of the human race.[3]

[1] Plutarch. Quæst. Rom. ii. 275. Macrob. Saturnal. l. i. c. 8. p. 152. ed. London. The arrival of Saturn (of his religious worship) in a ship, may indicate, that the savage coast of Latium was first discovered and civilized by the Phœnicians.

[2] In the ninth and tenth books of the Odyssey, Homer has embellished the tales of fearful and credulous sailors, who transformed the cannibals of Italy and Sicily into monstrous giants.

[3] The merit of discovery has too often been stained with avarice, cruelty, and fanaticism; and the intercourse of nations has produced the communication of disease and prejudice. A singular exception is due to the virtue of our own times and country. The five great voyages successively undertaken by the command of his present Majesty, were inspired by the pure and generous love of science and of mankind. The same prince, adapting his benefactions to the different stages of society, has founded a school of painting in his capital; and has introduced into the islands of the South Sea, the vegetables and animals most useful to human life.

INDEX.

BRADBURY, AGNEW, & CO., PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

1-7-83.

FREDERICK WARNE AND CO., PUBLISH...

Warne's Star Series.

In large fcap. 8vo.

1 Daisy. Elizabeth Wetherell.
2 Daisy in the Field. Elizabeth Wetherell.
3 Nettie's Mission. Alice Gray.
4 Stepping Heavenward. Mrs. E. Prentiss.
5 Willow Brook. Elizabeth Wetherell.
7 Dunallan. Grace Kennedy.
8 Father Clement. Grace Kennedy.
14 From Jest to Earnest. Rev. E. P. Roe.
15 Mary Elliot. Catherine D. Bell.
16 Sydney Stuart. Catherine D. Bell.
...cciola. X. B. Saintine.
...ope Campbell. Catherine D. Bell.
Horace and May. Catherine D. Bell.
Ella and Marian. Catherine D. Bell.
21 Kenneth and Hugh. Catherine D. Bell.
22 Rosa's Wish. Catherine D. Bell.
23 Margaret Cecil. Catherine D. Bell.
24 The Grahams. Catherine D. Bell.
25 Home Sunshine. Catherine D. Bell.
26 What Katy Did at School. Susan Coolidge.
28 Wearyfoot Common. Leitch Ritchie.
29 Sydonie's Dowry. By the Author of "Denise."
30 Aunt Jane's Hero. Mrs. E. Prentiss.
31 Aunt Ailie. Catherine D. Bell.
32 What Katy Did. Susan Coolidge.
33 Grace Huntley. Mrs. S. C. Hall.
34 Merchant's Daughter. Mrs. S. C. Hall.
35 Daily Governess. Mrs. S. C. Hall.
38 Flower of the Family. Mrs. E. P...
39 Madame Fontenoy. By the Author of ...
41 Toward Heaven. Mrs. E. ...
42 Little Camp on Eagle H... Elizabeth We...
45 The Prince of the House o... Rev. J. H. I...
46 The Pillar of Fire. Rev. J. H. In...
47 The Throne of David. Rev. J. H. I...
48 The Admiral's Will. M...
49 Sylvia and Janet.
51 That Lass o' Lowrie's. Frances H...
53 Cloverly. Mary ...
54 Alec Green. Silas K...
55 Sweet Council. Sar...
56 The Milestones of Life. Rev. A. ...
57 Little Women. L...
58 Little Wives. L...
59 Barriers Burned A...
60 Opening a Chest...
61 Uncle Tom's Cab...
63 Dorothy.
67 Pine Needles. Eliza...
68 Helen's Secret.
69 Huguenot Family. Cather...
70 Only a Girl's Life.
74 Bessie Harrington's ...
76 Without a Home. R...
77 Moods. Louis...
81 Lily Gordon. Cath...

BEDFORD STREET, STRAND.

CHANDOS CLASSICS

FREDERICK WARNE & CO
LONDON